







THE
Hammersmith Protestant Discussion;
BEING
AN AUTHENTICATED REPORT
OF
THE CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION

BETWEEN THE
REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.
OF THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHURCH, CROWN COURT, COVENT GARDEN,

AND

DANIEL FRENCH, ESQ.

BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

ON THE

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTESTANTISM AND POPERY

HELD AT HAMMERSMITH,

DURING THE MONTHS OF APRIL AND MAY, MDCCCXXXIX.

FROM THE SHORT-HAND NOTES OF

CHARLES MAYBURY ARCHER, ESQ.

NEW EDITION,
WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

LONDON :
ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1848.

THIS Edition is given verbatim from the Reporter's notes; improvements, both in expression and in reasoning, might, I am conscious, have been introduced into my portion of the work; but such a course would have been inconsistent with my desire to retain this Volume as a strict report of the Speeches as delivered. I have been deterred from altering Mr. French's portion by the fear of criticism, and the probable imputation of an unworthy motive. It should be remembered, that the Speeches were strictly extemporaneous.

I have read the sheets as they passed through the press, and can therefore attest the faithfulness and accuracy of this reprint.

JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

London, April, 1848.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS celebrated Discussion has excited the greatest interest both among Roman Catholics and Protestants—one proof of which is the rapid sale of upwards of 2,000 copies, though published at 14s. each, and the constant *demand* for a New Edition.

There were selected for discussion five great subjects ; there were two Chairmen at each Meeting, GEO. FINCH, Esq. M.P. on the Protestant side, and C. WELD, Esq., and subsequently J. KENDALL, Esq., on the Roman Catholic side. The audiences—half Protestant and half Roman Catholic—were admitted by tickets. The Discussion lasted eleven nights. The speeches were taken down *verbatim* by an able reporter, and are presented in *this* edition precisely as delivered. It is universally allowed to be the most masterly discussion of the whole subject in modern times. Mr. FRENCH displayed greater learning and acuteness than any controversialist on the same side, for a century and upwards ; but nothing can be more powerful and complete than the replies of his Reverend opponent,

whose perfect command of himself and his language contrasted most favourably with Mr. FRENCH, who occasionally displayed a lamentable want of temper.

The Publishers express the opinion of the most competent judges, when they state that this book ought to be in the hands of every Protestant in Britain, more particularly of Clergymen, Ministers, and Teachers: a more thorough acquaintance with the great Controversy may be acquired from this volume than from any other source.

HAMMERSMITH DISCUSSION.

FIRST EVENING, TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1839.

SUBJECT :

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

REV. JOHN CUMMING.—Let it be distinctly understood, in opening the following discussion, that I have no political or party ends to subserve—no personal animosities to indulge—no end, save the glory of Him whose I am, and whom I serve. My adversary appeared at one of our meetings, and then, and twice since, challenged me to discuss the awfully momentous points that are at issue between us. As he is a member of the Committee of the Roman Catholic Institute, officially sanctioned, and, *de facto*, an expositor of his faith, I have this day met him, to contend, not for victory, nor in a display of mere gladiatorship, but for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is so extravagant to my mind, that I could have wished my antagonist had opened the discussion. To be sure of the very words, the *ipsissima verba* of both Churches in reference to the Eucharist, as I mean to repeat and adhere to these words, I will quote from the authorized and recognised canons, articles, and formularies of either communion.

Council of Trent, Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist :—

CANON I. “If any shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, there is contained *truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but shall say that he is only in it in sign or figure, or power, let him be accursed.”

CANON II. “If any shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and remarkable conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood, while only the appearance of bread and wine remains, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation, let him be accursed.”

CANON VI. “If any shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored, and that outwardly with the worship of *Latria*, and therefore that he ought neither to be venerated by any especial festive celebration, nor carried solemnly about in processions, according to the universal and laud-

able rite and custom of the Church, or that he ought not publicly to be exhibited to the people that he may be worshipped, and that the worshippers of him are idolaters, let him be accursed."

CANON VIII. — "If any one shall say, that Christ, as exhibited in the Eucharist, is only *spiritually* eaten, and not also *sacramentally* and *really*, let him be accursed."

After these authentic and binding documents from the canons of the Council of Trent, I beg leave to add an extract from the creed of Pope Pius IV., which my learned opponent professes:—"And that in the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation."

The next authorized document of the Church of Rome from which I shall quote is THE CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. On this document Dr. Doyle, in his "Essay on the Catholic Claims," makes the following remarks:—"This Catechism is a most authentic exposition of our faith, inasmuch as it embodies and explains not only the doctrinal decisions of that Council, but also the several articles of the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed—the commandments of the decalogue—the precepts of the Church, the mass, and the sacraments as they are received and understood by all Catholics. This catechism has also been approved of and published by the Pope, and assented to by all the bishops in communion with the see of Rome, so that it may be considered an

epitome of Catholic doctrine and belief." p. 145. *Coyne, Dublin, 1826.*

"Jam vero hoc loco a pastoribus explicandum est non solum verum Christi corpus et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet VELUTI OSSA ET NERVOS sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento contineri."—*De Sacramento Eucharistiæ*, p. 241. Venetiis, apud Aldum, 1582.

"It is also in this place to be explained by the pastors, that there is contained not only the true body of Christ and whatever belongs to a true condition (or definition) of a body, such as BONES AND NERVES, but also a whole Christ."

In these documents we have the full and unshrinking explanation of Transubstantiation. In my references to the doctrine, therefore, I will adhere to these authorized terms as closely as possible, in order that, if offence may be taken at my phraseology, the Church of Rome may have, as is most justly due, the credit or discredit of it.

I now extract from the Confessions of the Reformed Catholic Churches of England and Scotland our views of the Eucharist:—

Thirty-nine Articles.—"The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of

Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith. The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

"The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

Confession of the Church of Scotland.—"In the supper, rightly used, Jesus Christ is so joined with us, that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls. Not that we imagine any Transubstantiation of the bread into Christ's natural body, and of wine into his natural blood, as the Papists have perniciously taught and damnably believed; but this union and conjunction which we have with the body and blood of Christ Jesus, in the right use of the sacrament, is wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who, by true faith, carrieth us above all things that are visible and carnal and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the body and blood of Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us, which now is in heaven and appeareth in the presence of his Father for us."

Westminster Confession, adopted by the Church of Scotland.—"Worthy receivers outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally, and corporeally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death. That

doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called Transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath been, and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea of gross idolatries."

Thus I have laid before you the bane and antidote. Let me now proceed a step further towards the discussion of this question, and glance at what I expect to be a favourite field with my opponent. I am perfectly persuaded that my learned opponent, too conscious of there being no proofs for Transubstantiation in the Scriptures, will have recourse to what are called the Fathers, and amid their mutilated and contradictory fragments, he will fish up, as from muddy waters, many a specious pretext. It is, therefore, most important, in the outset of this discussion, to lay down the precise amount of authority due to the FATHERS, in order that my opponent's quotations may always go for what they are worth.

1. These writers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, are not the fathers strictly so-called. The apostles and evangelists are the fathers of the Christian Church. The so-called fathers were mere voluntary recipients and distributors of the waters of life received from the original fountain, and, most unfortunately, the contents have not only caught the taint and flavour of the earthen vessels, but have become miserably diluted by human speculations, coloured by Eastern philosophy, and, ere they reach us, filtered of their more vital and precious ingredients.

2. The fathers are universally admitted to be *fallible*. Both the Church of Rome and the Protestant Church admit this.

3. Many of them *have erred, and that too on fundamental points*, in the opinion of the Church of Rome.

I call the most serious attention of every Roman Catholic in the room to the following extract of one of their own chief doctors, Delahogue, in proof of this:—"In order that one may be called by the name of father, it is not required, indeed, that he shall have committed no errors; since St. Justin holds an honourable place among them, who thought that the happiness of the pious dead was to be postponed till the day of the final judgment. St. Irenæus, who patronized the error of the Millennarians; St. Cyprian, who believed that the baptism conferred by heretics was to be repeated. Moreover, Origen and Tertullian, who have erred in so many *points*, have been constantly reckoned among the fathers."—*Treatise on Ch.* 3d edit. 1829.

This opinion of Delahogue is of itself sufficient to shake the professed confidence of Roman Catholics in writings partly mutilated—partly corrupted—partly erroneous, and wholly uninspired and fallible.

4. The *fathers contradict* each other. The Council of Trent, ch. i. sess. 21, admits that they give various interpretations on the 54th verse of the 6th chapter of John; and Bellarmine (*De Sac. Euch.* lib. i. ch. v.) gives a catalogue of doctors and learned Romanists who give the Protestant interpretation to the above verse.

5. The fathers *were never deputed* to give forth the voice of the church on Transubstantiation, or on any other dogma. They were neither authorized nor delegated to do so.

6. In the next place, all the fathers

that can be quoted, or appealed to, are a mere fragment of the writings of those who actually composed on doctrinal subjects, or who were better employed. Those lost may have held opinions contrary to those that are left, so that if all the fathers that remain were, as they are not, unanimous in favour of Transubstantiation, it would not avail. The opinions of the remaining fathers on this doctrinal point, even if unanimous, would not, from these facts, weigh a feather with me; for what are the opinions of a thousand *fallible* books against the contrary judgment of one *inspired and infallible* penman?

On this tenet of Transubstantiation, the fact is, the fathers held *three* distinct and antagonist opinions. This I am ready to prove by references, the moment my opponent requires them. One section holds the opinion of the thirty-nine articles and the Westminster Confession. A *second* section holds consubstantiation—and a *third* section, partly from scholastic mutilation—partly from hyperbolic phraseology—partly from their application of the name of the thing signified to the symbol, is twisted by the Church of Rome to the countenance of a dogma of the ninth century—Transubstantiation.

I am prepared, this evening, if required, to show that Augustine, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and Theodoret, maintain the doctrine of the Reformed churches on the Eucharist; in other words, I am prepared to quote passages from each of these fathers, in which they proclaim the doctrine of the Protestant Church in reference to the Lord's Supper. This is my first position. In the second place, I am ready to prove that others of the fathers maintained Consubstantiation. Irenæus and Chrysostom

are the advocates of Consubstantiation, if their language be taken literally. And, in the third place, I candidly admit that a remnant of the fathers, whose sentiments my learned antagonist will quote to-day, employ language which may be pleaded as strongly in favour of Transubstantiation. At the same time, I would add, that Bellarmine, a distinguished advocate of the Church of Rome, says, it is not wholly improbable that *there is not a passage in the Word of God so express as to compel the admission of Transubstantiation*, and he quotes several distinguished scholastic divines, who admit that it may not be in the Word of God, and, that there is not, in the Word of God, a passage that goes to compel the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Again, I may also repeat that the Council of Trent admits that, on the 54th verse of the 6th chapter of St. John, which probably my learned friend will bring forward this evening, and which I will require him to prove to be descriptive of the Lord's supper at all, there are *various interpretations*. I may mention *en passant*, that Justin Martyr did not know of certain ceremonies essential to the worship of Roman Catholics, such as the ringing of bells, the elevation, and the adoration of the Host, and many other similar rites. I am prepared to show, in the next place, that the Church of Rome has, contrary to the practice of the fathers, withdrawn the cup from the laity, maintaining that the officiating priest alone ought to partake of the cup, and that it is quite sufficient for the rest to partake of the bread alone, as containing the *whole body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God*.

I am prepared to show, from documents, that the Church of Rome, who professedly makes much of the

fathers, has positively anathematized the opinions of some of the most distinguished of them. Cyprian holds that all the apostles were equal in power, but the Church of Rome holds the *man anathematized* that does not give to Peter the supremacy. St. Jerome excludes the Apocrypha, and therefore HE comes under the anathema of the Church of Rome. Augustine opposes appeals to Rome, and therefore HE comes under the anathema of the Church of Rome. Ambrose deprecates the *judicial* power which the Church of Rome assumes for her priests, and therefore HE is anathematized by the Church of Rome. Irenæus gives the creed as the only tradition. St. Chrysostom advocates the indiscriminate reading of the Word of God. St. Athanasius holds the sentiments of the Protestant Church, and not of the Church of Rome, in reference to the sacred canon. These fathers all come under the curses of Trent. The fathers hold sometimes, some of them, the doctrines of the reformed churches; sometimes, some of them, the doctrine of Consubstantiation, and are by the Tridentine fathers anathematized for it; and sometimes, some of them, in different passages, are so highly oriental and figurative, that they have given occasion to the doctors of the Church of Rome to deduce from them the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Now, I ask, what does this imply? Why it amounts to this: that if these fathers are so contradictory of each other, and of themselves—if they are admitted on both sides not to be inspired, and by the Church of Rome not only to be *fallible*, but also to have *erred*, and thereby are virtually under the anathemas of Trent,—if it has been admitted by the Roman Catholic Church that they have erred in points that go directly to the

foundation of the whole system of papal supremacy—then I do say it is time that we should have done with *secondary* and contradictory *testimony*, and have recourse to the *first-rate* and only harmonious source,—the ORACLES OF THE LIVING GOD. I say it is time that we should have done with writers who constitute together but a nose of wax, that may be turned and twisted to every and any side that a skilful controversialist pleases; and that we should go to those pure fountains which *both of us* acknowledge to be the inspiration of the Almighty, to those words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, and not to the words which man's wisdom teacheth.

Having shown you the conflicting sentiments of the fathers—having explained to you the doctrine of the Church of Rome in reference to Transubstantiation, I have now to observe that this doctrine involves first the following important and momentous position:—If Transubstantiation be true, then observe, last Sunday, *our Lord's soul and divinity, body and blood, bones and nerves*, were on every altar and every chapel of the Church of Rome; or, in other words, last Sunday our Lord was *corporeally* and *substantially* present on the ten thousand altars of the Church of Rome; and again at the Mass, celebrated this morning in any chapel of the Roman Catholic Church, our Lord Jesus was present on the altar, soul and divinity, body and blood, BONES and NERVES,—all, in fact, that is required to constitute a true body. This is the first position involved in this tenet. I shall proceed, therefore, to show, at the very outset of my remarks, that the Word of God most distinctly declares, that while our Lord is *spiritually* present with his Church,—“Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of

the world,”—it most distinctly declares, that our Lord Jesus Christ is *not* any longer present *corporeally*. You observe, therefore, that the position which I am ready to prove to you, is that our Lord is not *corporeally* in the midst of us. The first passage which I shall quote is contained in Acts iii. 21:—“Whom the heaven must receive *until the times of the restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” Whenever my learned antagonist may wish it, my rev. friend behind me will read from the Douay Bible, for in both the versions these passages are substantially if not verbatim the same.

This passage says, that the heavens must receive our Lord “until the times of the restitution of all things;” but, according to the Church of Rome, he leaves heaven, and, *body and blood, soul and divinity, bones and nerves*, appears upon the altar, after the priest has pronounced the words, “*Hoc est enim corpus meum.*” Again (Matt. xxvi. 11), “Ye have the poor always with you, but *me ye have not always.*” Observe, the reference was here made to an act of beneficence. We read that, “When the disciples saw it they were indignant, saying, To what purpose is this waste?” Jesus answered, “Ye have the poor always with you, but *me ye have not always.*” But if Christ was to be corporeally in the midst of his people, then his disciples would have said, “We have thee always with us;” whereas our Lord said, No, “*me ye have not always.*” that is to say, he is not always corporeally present with his Church. Again, I refer you to 2 Cor. v. 16: “Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: *yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no*

more after the flesh." "Henceforth," says the apostle, "we know him no more after the flesh." Though we have known him after the flesh, that is, though we have personally seen him, and gazed on that countenance which was "more marred than any man's," and beheld those tears which rolled down his cheeks, yet now "we know him no more after the flesh;" and, therefore, if *Transubstantiation be correct, the apostle must be wrong*; but both sides admit that the apostle must be indubitably right, and therefore the inference must be, that the Church of Rome is necessarily and fatally wrong.

My next quotation is taken from the epistle to the Colossians, ch. iii. ver. 1: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, *where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.*" Now, observe, here is the statement most distinctly and plainly announced, that our Lord "sitteth at the right hand of God;" but the Church of Rome says, according to canons of the Council of Trent, according to the creed of Pope Pius the 4th, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *that our Lord is substantially and corporeally present*, to the whole extent which I have repeatedly stated, upon every altar, at every chapel, and at every cathedral of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, then, the Scriptures say, "He sitteth at the right hand of God"—*bodily*, at the right hand of God. The Church of Rome says, he is upon the altar when the priest has said, "*Hoc enim est corpus meum.*" I ask, then, whether I am to believe the one or the other? for I maintain, that if the canons of the Council of Trent be true, the Word of God must be untrue; but, on the other hand, if the Word of God be truth, then I maintain that the canons of the Council

of Trent ought to be cast "to the moles and to the bats." I say, "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Again, I quote another passage, demonstrative of the untruthfulness of Transubstantiation, Matt. xxiv. 26: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: Behold, he is in the secret chambers, *believe it not.*" Now the Greek word here rendered "secret chambers," denotes literally "boxes, cupboards, corners," &c. The Gospel says, "If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the secret chambers," or the corners, or pixes, or cupboards, ye "are not to believe it." Is it not, then, infatuation and folly to teach that our Lord is present in the consecrated wafer; that he is put into a pix, and carried about, and presented to the adoration of the people for worship? which the Church of Rome herself owns to be the worship of Latria, the supreme worship given to God. This, then, is my first position. Whenever my antagonist shall bring forward his arguments, I shall be prepared, in the strength of God, and by the aid of his Holy Spirit, to reply to them. Transubstantiation will be placed before you in the course of this important discussion, and then, if the *wafer* "be God, then you are to worship it." I use the words in a figurative sense, and add, "If the Lord be God, then follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." If Protestantism have truth on its side, it is, my friends, at the peril of your precious and immortal souls that you reject it; but if the Roman Catholic Church have truth on her side, then it is equally at the peril of your immortal souls that you reject it.

I say, the matter now before us is to be fairly, fully, and impartially discussed. I am, therefore, prepared to demonstrate, that the position of

the Church of Rome is no sacred position—a position not warranted by the word of the living God. My Roman Catholic antagonist will reply, “Very true; but may not the body of Christ be in many places at once; so that while that body is, in a sense, now ‘seated at the right hand of God,’ may it not also be strictly true that it is also to be found upon the altars of the Roman Catholic Church?” Now, in the first place, this destroys the nature of a true body. Is it not the characteristic of our blessed Redeemer that “in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren;” that is, in every peculiarity and feature, and characteristic of real humanity, “sin only excepted,” of which he was clearly and utterly void; yet in all other points, observe, it became a necessary characteristic of our blessed Lord that he should be “like unto his brethren.” Now, if that be the case, he cannot be corporeally here and be corporeally at London, and at Edinburgh, and at Paris, all at the same instant. It is a necessary characteristic of a *true body* to be only present, as far as we know, in one spot at once.

To show you that this is not a mere idea of my own, I will quote from the sacred penman these words (Matthew xxviii. 5, 6):—“And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, as he said.” The words are substantially the same in the Douay Bible. Now observe what is admitted in this? The angel most distinctly said, “He is not here;” why? because “he is risen.” What, then, is the inference? That he cannot be here bodily, and yet risen, and bodily at the right hand of God at one and the same moment. The Scriptures plainly and

pointedly declare that our Lord “is not here;” but that “he is risen;” and, if risen corporeally, that he is necessarily not here corporeally.

The next quotation is from the Gospel of St. Luke, xxiv. 39: “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” Now to what did our Lord appeal? He says, *see me* with your eyes, *behold me* and *see*, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have; but the Church of Rome says, that his BONES are present on the altar of every chapel in the Roman Catholic Church; yet our Lord declares, that unless ye see his wounds, unless ye behold his flesh, ye do not behold his bodily presence, and, therefore, he is not bodily and substantially present on the altar. The *host* that the priest holds has neither hands nor feet, nor (I use the words of the Roman Church) bones, nor nerves, nor body, nor blood; *ergo*, it is not the bodily presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. I quote another passage from St. John, xx. 27: “Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing.” Now, observe, our Lord, *after his resurrection*, retained upon his body the marks of the nails on his sacred hands and of the thorns about his once bleeding brows, and of the spear that wounded his holy side. And, observe, when Thomas doubted that he was present—thought that Christ had not risen, and that he was not bodily present among them, what did our Lord say? Our Lord put it to the test in this most decisive manner,—“*Handle me and see; thrust thy hand into my side, believe the marks of the nails, and see that it is I myself.*” Now, if you take

the wafer on the altar of the Church of Rome, has *that* any trace of the wounds? Has that any features demonstrative of the characteristics of a natural body? If I speak to it, will it reply? If I ask it a question, will it say, "Handle me, and see, and believe; that a spirit has not flesh and bones?" What then must be the inference, if we take the *criteria* of our Lord's presence as given in the Gospels—if we take the plain and explicit testimony of sacred writ? The inference must be, that our Lord is not present in his body and blood, soul and divinity, *ossa et nervos*—bones and nerves—on the altars of the Roman Catholic Church.

I know my friend will fashion most ingenious and subtle discriminations about the existence of *species* and accidents; but, remember, we must have a decisive declaration. It is either a simple piece of flour and water, or it is what the Church of Rome calls it,—the body and blood, soul and divinity, bones and nerves of the Son of God. No scholastic discrimination as to accidents and species will satisfy your judgments on the point, especially as there seems to be an overwhelming torrent of inspiration to bring contempt and odium on the awful notion by which the minds of our Roman Catholic friends are blinded and deceived. It will require the most circumstantial and lucid demonstration to show—in the very teeth of such a volume of sacred disproofs—that Christ is present, in the way in which he is explained to be in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, on the altars of the Roman Catholic Church.

I quote next, Matthew xxiv. 27:—"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." Now here is an

express declaration that our Lord, when he cometh to us in his bodily presence, he comes like the lightning that streams amidst splendour and amidst beauty from the east even unto the west. And therefore, my learned adversary will be prepared to show, that when the priest has pronounced the words of consecration, our Lord comes down upon the altar amid the coruscations and the glory wherewith the lightning shines and buries itself in the far distant west. But since we know that we behold no such rays or splendour accompanying the assumed bodily presence of Christ on the altar of the Church of Rome, we justly infer that he is not bodily, substantially, and corporeally there.

I quote the Acts of the Apostles, i. 10, 11: "And whilst they (the apostles) looked stedfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." How did he go into heaven? He rose in an impressive, beautiful, and glorious manner. Well, the Holy Spirit says, when he comes again, he is to come precisely in the same way. Now we have seen him go into heaven one way, *i. e.* amid glory and splendour: then, we ask, is it the fact in the experience of the Church of Rome that he *thus* comes to their altars? Will my Roman Catholic antagonist, or any Roman Catholic priest, maintain that the moment the words are syllabled, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, that our Lord comes down from heaven amid beams of glory and of splendour, when he appears upon the altars of the Church of Rome? And yet, I must believe, if God's word be true, that "he

shall so come in *like manner*," as the apostles beheld him retire from this dismantled, evil, and sin-stained world. The inference must be so; and I know not how any one, with this blessed book in his hand, can venture to affirm otherwise,—I know not how the Church of Rome can pronounce her *anathema* on me for believing what the Holy Spirit declares—I repeat, the inference must be, that our Lord is *not* corporeally present upon the altars of the Roman Catholic Church, as far as I can find the evidences of that presence, as these are here distinctly and emphatically proclaimed. The last passage which I shall quote, is from Revelations i. 7: "Behold he *cometh with clouds*, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." I then ask, if he thus "*cometh with clouds*," is there any evidence of it, is there any semblance of it in the Roman Catholic Church when the wafer is turned into the body and blood, the soul and divinity, bones and nerves, of the Son of God?

I shall not, on the present occasion, bring forward other disproofs of this most extraordinary dogma, *i. e.* that our Lord is present *corporeally* on the altars of the Church of Rome. But I would just mention one simple fact respecting the origin of this notion, which, indeed, I ought to have done before. The doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist was first started on the occasion of a dispute as to the worship of images, in opposition to which the Council of Constantinople, in 754, contended that Christ had left us no other image than the bread—the image of his body. Rhadbert Paschasius, a monk of the ninth century, according to Bellarmine, was the first who had seriously and copiously written

concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. This monk, by Bellarmine's admission, was the first author who wrote *seriously* and *copiously* concerning it; so that 800 years passed away before any author wrote *seriously* and *copiously* about the bodily presence, and yet, during these 800 years, the fathers and other doctors had written *copiously* and *seriously* on almost every doctrine and duty. Again, Duns Scotus, Fellow and Professor of Divinity at Merton College, Oxford, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, allows that Transubstantiation was not always necessary to be believed, and that the necessity of believing it was consequent on the declaration of the Church, made at the sanguinary fourth Council of Lateran, in 1215, under Innocent III. Durandus, Bishop of Meaux, acknowledges his inclination to believe the contrary of Transubstantiation, if the Church had not obliged men to believe it. [Here the rev. gentleman's hour expired.]

MR. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen, it is to me, I candidly confess, in rising to address you, a most pleasing and delightful spectacle to behold so many persons, of either sex, this evening, assembled together, for the noble, the exalted purpose of hearing, in solemn silence, and with the calm composure of minds open to conviction, the cause of sacred truth luminously explained, and, with the help of Almighty God, which I believe both my reverend friend and myself have with fervour implored before our entrance into this room, not only luminously explained, but vigorously as well as copiously defended. Yes, my friends, truth, sacred truth, will this day, by the efforts of the successful combatant, be placed before you, in all its native majesty and

charms ; whilst on the other hand, error, on whichever side it may be found to be—for I have no right to assume that it is on mine—error will be, by this same energetic power of argument on the part of him that shall prevail, stripped of all its false pretensions, and exposed to every eye, in all its native deformity. In other words, by one of these our conflicting labours, *that* will come to pass this day, which our blessed Saviour has uttered, “Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.” St. Matt. xv. 13.

Yes, my respected friends, this day, I confidently trust, will arouse many a slumbering soul to deep and solemn meditation on that most vital, most important of all subjects for the mind of a Christian to revolve, namely, whether it be indeed true, or whether it be but an idle fiction, a mere empty sound, that “*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.*” St. John vi. 53. And here permit me to say, what I most sanguinely anticipate, namely, that some persons who have entered this room this evening (though I am aware that many have entered it without leaving their prejudices behind them), will go out of it entirely altered men or women, as to the whole texture of their religious sentiments, firmly and unconquerably resolved to obey the operations of Divine grace beaming upon their hearts, so soon as I shall have placed the truth in full blaze before them. Yes, I repeat it, so soon as their understandings shall have been convinced by the force of irresistible and unanswerable arguments, that when the Lord Jesus Christ said, some time before the Last Supper, to his disciples, preparing them for that grand and august sacrament which he was about to institute,—

“The bread that I will give you is my flesh,” St. John vi. 51; and that when afterwards *at* the Last Supper he said, with clear, solemn, testamentary emphasis, “This *is* my body, this *is* my blood,” St. Matt. xxvi. 26-28, that he meant it to be understood, as is expounded by his own words, “*Verily, verily,*” and not as expounded by the tongues of Protestants, “*Figuratively, figuratively.*”

The gentleman who is this day opposed to me has, more than once during his address to you, deprecated any introduction, on my part, of the glorious fathers of the church. My reverend opponent, I must also remark, has boasted more than once, in his endeavours to subvert or to disprove the doctrine of the Catholic Eucharist, which doctrine is, as he has properly defined it, though in other words,—the real presence of our Lord’s glorious and blessed body, under the species of corruptible elements; he has boasted, I say, that, in accomplishing this, the sphere of his argumentation shall principally be the Bible, a book upon which he defies me to support my principle. Now the Bible, I reply, or the New Testament, shall also be my prime bulwark in defending it. Yes, my friends, I will meet him, foot to foot, on that hallowed ground: nay more, I will encounter him at the very entrance of it, as it were, with the four flaming swords of the cherubim to guard the stand I take: I mean, my friends, the express texts of the four Evangelists, and, added to them, that powerful body of auxiliaries, the texts of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. But, my friends, whilst I also glory in claiming the Bible as my chief prop, I cannot consent to deprive myself, in corroborating my deductions from that inspired volume, of the benefit to be derived to me from de-

ductions precisely similar to my own, made in every age, since the foundation of Christianity, by the renowned and glorious fathers of the Church. I cannot—I will not consent, in accommodation to modern dictators in theology, to break asunder that sacred link of tradition which hands down to me, in one regular, harmonious, beautiful line of unbroken succession, from age to age, and from father to father, the dogma of the Catholic Eucharist: namely, that in this sacrament Christ gave unto us his blessed body; yes, his very flesh to eat, and his very blood to drink.

No, my friends, I do not wonder at this his earnest deprecation against my introducing the fathers of the Church, on the part of my learned opponent. Were I in his situation, I should have made a similar appeal to my antagonist. But no, gentlemen, I *must* have recourse to them; such an overwhelming argument cannot be passed by, by the Catholic who is solicitous to do full justice to the glorious cause he has undertaken to defend. It is an argument, my friends, that of itself, without the necessity of any close, scrutinizing inspection into the inspired pages, will for ever enable the Catholic, I will not say to frown, but to smile defiance on his Protestant antagonist; who vainly endeavours, by his feeble outcry, to silence the loud voice that issues forth from the depth of ages—a voice, my friends, which has never ceased to re-echo, uninterruptedly, for now nearly nineteen centuries, from clime to clime, and from one end of Christendom to the other—the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

I shall, therefore, gentlemen, in my view of things (for I will never permit any one to prescribe to me the line which I think proper to adopt in my disputation)—I shall

therefore place before you, in the very front of this discussion, a quotation from one of those glorious fathers, in order to render the course which I am about to pursue more simple and easy. I shall lay before you one ever-memorable, ever-dazzling extract: and I shall content myself, probably, with this, or at most one or two more, during the course of the limited time now prescribed to me. It is a quotation from St. Ignatius Martyr, who was a disciple, as Archbishop Wake, a Protestant archbishop, tells us, of St. John the Evangelist, and who was appointed, as the same archbishop tells us, to the see of Antioch, by the apostle St. Peter. *He*, therefore, (St. Ignatius,) as I humbly conceive, ought to have known something, at least, of genuine Christianity, having had the benefit of such tuition, under such transcendently holy and incontrovertibly inspired masters. He laid his very life down in the cause of his blessed Redeemer, facing with undaunted fortitude the fierce and hungry lion in the amphitheatre at Rome, and dying with joy and gladness, in order to drink full streams of joy and gladness for ever in the presence of the immaculate Lamb. Such a person, surely, will not be spoken of slightly by my eloquent and my pious friend. He, surely, can never undervalue Ignatius, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist; and if, in the warmth of discussion, he should call him "*oriental*," metaphorical," or "*figurative*,"—which, I believe, were the epithets he ascribes to the language of the fathers, I shall beg of him, in an argumentative, not orientalizing manner, when he arises to answer me, to do away, if he can, or to invalidate the strength of this infrangible passage in our favour and to show me wherein the *orientalism* and figurativeness of the

expression consists. I shall hand it over to him, in order that he may see that I quote it fairly, and explain it to you with the utmost accuracy and the utmost precision. [*Hand it over, if you please, Mr. Weld, to Mr. Finch, the Chairman on the other side.*] Bear in mind, my friends, that this Ignatius, who lived in the earliest ages of Christianity, as I told you, ought most unquestionably to know what was pure and unadulterated Christianity. As these words are most important, I shall quote them in Greek, as I have not the book now in hand; do not alarm yourselves, however, for I shall translate them immediately into English. He is talking of certain persons whom he calls heretics, and he says of these heretics,—“*They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and which flesh, in his goodness, the Father resuscitated.*”—Ed. Pears. et Smith, Oxon. 1709. [Mr. French having parted with the book, repeated and construed the Greek from memory.]

Now, you see, my friends, in the first place, that there were certain heretics that absented themselves from the Eucharist in those days. And why, let me ask, did they thus absent themselves from a participation of that heavenly food? Why, Ignatius tells you, that they absented themselves because they would not believe that it was “*the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ;*” and, mark the accuracy of the expression!—meaning to show what flesh, and that you might not imagine it to be an oriental expression, he says, “*which flesh,*” not which bread “*suffered for our sins.*” It goes on; the passage goes on to show, that it is not mere inanimate flesh, which the Protestant, unac-

quainted with the subject, imagines the Catholic to take; namely, a bit of flesh, or so many drops of blood; but he says, “*which flesh the Father, in his goodness, resuscitated,*” or raised up, that is to say, the flesh of Christ, animated with his immortal soul, with his eternal Spirit; in other words, “*Christ,*” as the Council of Trent has it, and as my learned friend, with the utmost accuracy has expressed it, “*Christ truly God, and truly man, whole and entire.*”

Such, gentlemen, is the Catholic doctrine. Whether accurate or not, we shall examine when we come to notice my learned friend's observations. But you have here, already, my friends, the demonstration of a fact, which, in my own humble opinion, supersedes the necessity of any further inspection into the fathers of the Church at all; not that I shall limit myself to this one solitary quotation, but I say it is so powerful a quotation as to admit of no dispute as to its force and invincibility. It will be in vain for my learned friend to say he is not a true father of the Church, because he is not an inspired apostle. What! a man educated by St. John the Evangelist,—a man appointed Bishop of Antioch, by St. Peter, not a father! aye, and a *grandfather*, too, if I may use an illustrative expression of the learned gentleman. [Applause and hisses from different parts of the room, and cries of “*Order!*”]

Thus you see, my friends, that even in the days of the apostles the loud, bold voice of Protestantism was already heard resounding. There were men, even in those bright-dawning days, as St. Ignatius tells us,—there were men who absented themselves from the holy Eucharist, because they could not make up their minds to believe in that doctrine which the Catholic so firmly

believes in. [Here the learned gentleman was interrupted, and the meeting was called to "Order."] Silence being obtained, the learned gentleman continued: I must request my Catholic friends not to set so bad an example. It is disgraceful in the extreme. It does not animate me; it rather depresses me, to hear such bursts of acclamation. It confuses me—destroys the thread of my disputation, and does no good to yourselves. Yes, there were men (says St. Ignatius) who lived and died aliens and strangers to those heavenly rays which illuminated the eyes of the believing and the adoring Catholic.

But, my friends, why should this excite our wonder and astonishment, when we reflect, that scarcely had the sacred lips of a Man-God (when here upon earth) announced the grand sacrament which he was about to institute, when murmurings arose and spread around him from mouth to mouth, questioning its possibility, even in his blessed presence. "*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*" exclaimed the first Protestants of whom history makes mention. "*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*" St. John vi. 52. Here, my friends, it occurs to me, that I may, perchance, have given some assistance to my learned friend and opponent, in tracing the existence of his Church up to the apostolical days. However, gentlemen, I am generous enough to give him all the advantage he can possibly reap from this concession on my part; suffice it for me to call his attention, and your attention, to this one undeniable fact:—that "from that time forward," it is said, "they (the first Protestants) walked no more with him." St. John vi. 66. No, they left the teaching of our blessed Saviour, in order to dogmatize for

themselves; "*their ears*," to use the language of the apostle, "*could not endure sound doctrine*;" they continued wandering in their vain imaginations, through all the interminable mazes of infidelity and scepticism, instead of acquiescing with lowly and implicit confidence in the unerring words of Him who is "the way, the truth, and the life;" "in whose lips was no guile," in whose words was no possibility of deception; instead of crying out with Peter—the rock upon which Christ built his church—in reply to his Divine Master, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life," St. John vi. 68; thou hast said unto me, and said unto all thy followers, that "unless we eat thy flesh and drink thy blood, we have no life within us."

I must here observe, that I shall be very willing, in imitation of the example set by my learned friend, to refer immediately to the pages of the Bible and of the New Testament, chiefly in order to prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation; but, at the same time, I hope that you will not deem it a departure from the system pointed out, to which I shall, in some respects, be very willing to adhere,—I say, I hope you will not deem it a deviation from that system, if, whilst I refer to particular parts of Scripture, I likewise refer to the fathers of the Church, who, in the respective ages of that Church, explained these passages and these texts precisely in the same manner as we Catholics do at the present day. My reverend opponent has told you, that he is prepared, this evening, to adduce St. Augustine, and St. Jerome, with other fathers, as evidence against the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Rev. Dr. CUMMING.—No; not St. Jerome: St. Augustine and others.

MR. FRENCH.—Oh! he says, not St. Jerome: St. Augustine and others. Now, if there be one of all the fathers more copious than another, and more nervous in explaining this doctrine, so that a child may understand him, it is the glorious St. Augustine. And before I come to confine myself solely to the books of the New Testament, I must beg leave to quote one or two passages from that renowned father of the Church, *especially* as the learned gentleman has lighted upon him. I shall merely observe, before I cite, that Calvin has panegyricized this father, the great St. Augustine, above all others that ever took pen in hand. The quotations which are brought against me by my learned friend from this saint, I am prepared to meet, and to show the meaning of them to be in our favour; but I doubt very much whether the learned gentleman, with all the versatility of his genius, will be able to give a different interpretation to the passage I am about to cite from than that which I and all Catholics deduce from it.

St. Augustine, speaking of that text in which is recorded the murmuring of the Jews, *i. e.* "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" has this remarkable passage:—"Durus est hic sermo quis potest eum audire." "Yes," says St. Augustine, "Durus est, sed duris, incredibile est sed incredulis." That is, "It is hard,—aye, but to those only who are themselves hard. It is incredible, aye, but to those only who are themselves incredulous." (*De Verb. Evang. Johan.* vol. v. p. 640, edit. Bened.) Why, every one must here see, without any comment of mine, the plain meaning of St. Augustine's words. This allusion of the father must most unquestionably have referred to the difficulty of believing in Transub-

stantiation on the part of those whose hearts are too hard to be penetrated by the beams of heavenly grace. But is he the *only* father that has done this? No, my friends, there are about nine or ten fathers who have referred to this very passage, viz. "This is a hard saying."

I have given you St. Augustine; we will now take St. Cyril of Alexandria, who flourished in the year of our Lord 412. I have the Greek, if my learned opponent wishes to see it. I shall give you the English of it:—"But if thou persist, oh Jew! in urging this, *how*, I will, in like manner, ask you how was the rod of Moses transformed into a serpent? how was the water changed into the nature of blood?" (Tom. iv. p. 359, edit. Aubert, Lutetia, 1638.) The next father to whom I shall refer lived in the year 369, viz., the illustrious St. Basil, who observes:—"We must not indulge in doubts or disputes concerning what our Lord has said, but cherish a full conviction that every word of his is true and possible of effect, *although nature should combat against its possibility; for it is in this very point in which the struggle of faith consists.* The Jews, therefore, struggled with one another, saying, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' Therefore he said to them, 'Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.'" (1 John vi. 53.) *Regul. 8. Moral.* tom. ii. p. 240, edit. Ben.

Now, I see no "oriental" cast of expression in these passages; and, if there be none, then I affirm that these fathers of the Church were all genuine Papists; and however the learned gentleman may think it fashionable, in the nineteenth century, to run down these fathers of the Church, and cast, as it were, a contemptuous eye upon

them, I would have him to know, that whole volumes of praises have been written upon their veracity by the most distinguished doctors of the Church of England. It is only in this nineteenth century that the fashion has arisen of decrying these renowned, these celebrated fathers. They have ever been claimed by the doctors of the Church of England as *their* fathers, speaking *their* language, enforcing *their* tenets, and overturning ours. Strange infatuation on their part! one is apt to exclaim, when I bring such passages to confront them; and I grant it is an inconsistency which I have never been able to account for. But so it is; and it is for them to reconcile it to sense and logic: all I shall say is, that the more you are introduced, my friends, to the knowledge of these fathers, the more will you be persuaded that you have been deceived in your deductions.

The grand dispute between you Protestants and us Catholics is this: which is the primitive Church? Now, we have a Church, existing in the present day, that assimilates itself, by demonstrable proof, not by mere assertion, to the Church of pure, unadulterated antiquity. I take you up to the earliest fathers of the Church; or, as my learned friend facetiously called them, the grand-fathers of the Church, the apostles and the evangelists, and they will confound you. Again; I take you next to St. Ignatius, their disciple, and the passage I have read you from St. Ignatius is equally confounding to all your pretensions. I hope my rev. opponent will be able to answer that passage; for mark, my friends, the difficulty of answering it. Ignatius, a man educated among evangelists and apostles, declares, that "it is the flesh of Jesus, which flesh the Father, in his good-

ness, resuscitated." The rev. gentleman has quoted Justin Martyr: I, therefore, in turn, shall in due time take up Justin Martyr into my hands. I shall quote a passage from Justin Martyr, and a most important quotation it is. But I would merely observe before I begin, and that must be deferred until I rise a second time to address you, that Archbishop Tillotson, who wrote the first elaborate treatise, as he calls it—I call it mere declamation—against our doctrines, professes to begin with the earliest father, and takes this very identical passage of Justin Martyr to which my friend has alluded; but he does not say one single word on the above-quoted passage of the still earlier Ignatius; no, he makes Justin to be the first father, and has not the candour to tell his Protestant brethren, that such a man as Ignatius ever lived—ever existed. But he takes Justin Martyr, and he attempts to prove his position to you, from the passage in question, which will compel you all, in my humble opinion, to cry out, that Justin Martyr is a decided Roman Catholic.

And now permit me to make one or two observations on my reverend opponent's method of proceeding in this discussion. I am sure my reverend opponent has no intention, in the course of his comments, to wound the feelings of his Catholic brethren. I acquit him of any intention of that kind; but I must say he has dwelt on some things in a manner that appears to me extremely indecorous; and my friend must know, that it would be a very powerful engine of ridicule on the part of a Pagan or an unbeliever, if, when alluding to Christ, our blessed and adorable Redeemer, he were to talk of his bones and nerves when he appeared to his

disciples. How would he relish such a question put to him by the disciples of Tom Paine, or any other person who blasphemes the Christian religion, if they asked him whether, in the ascension of our Lord's glorious body, he took his nerves and his bones along with him? It appears to me to be an extremely improper style of argument and language; indeed, I would, in my turn, ask my reverend opponent, when he asks me if we Catholics hold, that when our blessed Saviour is taken in the sacramental manner in which he is taken,—if we, I say, hold that the nerves and bones are there; I would ask my friend, would he not be rather shocked if a Deist, or any of the disciples of those philosophers or Deists whom I have just mentioned, were to ask him,—when our Saviour came, without disturbing the walls or the doors, and appeared in the midst of his disciples after death,—if he had his nerves and his bones with him? He would be perfectly shocked, I say, at such a question being put to him on the part of the unbeliever, which he, as a believer, puts to the Catholic.

There is no propriety, therefore, nor is there any necessity for such language. When we say that we receive our Saviour's body, soul, and divinity, we think that we state our meaning with sufficient clearness, without descending into any *minutiæ*. Again, you say that there is no improbability in our Saviour's appearing, when the doors were shut, in the midst of his disciples, after he had been dead and buried, and had risen. You say there is no improbability in that, but you reject Transubstantiation, because by this your common sense or notion of things is subverted, your senses are beguiled,—because it is not in unison with the laws of nature. Can

you not be sufficiently spiritualized to see your blessed Saviour's glorious and celestialized body come with the same facility as that with which it penetrated stone walls and communicated itself, without reserve, to each humble believer, in every part of the whole habitable world? My learned friend sees a great objection in this, on the ground of philosophical impossibility; but neither the learned doctors of the Church of England nor the original reformers saw any such impossibility. Luther says, "They that deny the presence of Christ in the sacrament, what means have they (the Sacramentarians—that is, the deniers of the Real Presence in the sacrament) to prove these propositions contradictory,—*Christ is in heaven, and Christ is in the supper?* The contradiction is in their own carnal imagination, not in faith, nor in the word of God."—*Defens. Verb. Cænæ*, 388. Wittenberg, 1557.

John Calvin says, "We do not dispute what God can do, but what he wills."—*Init. Inst.*

Jewel confesses that "God is able, by his omnipotent power, to make Christ's body present without place or quantity."—*Reply to Dr. Harding*, p. 352.

Cranmer confesses "that Christ may be in the bread and wine, as also in the doors that were shut, and the stones of the sepulchre."—*Answer to Gardiner and Smith*, p. 454.

John Fox says, "Christ, abiding in heaven, may be in the sacrament also."—*Acts and Monum.* p. 998.

Melancthon says, "I had rather die than affirm with the Zuinglians, that Christ's body can be but in one place."—*Epist. ad Martino Gerold.*

Dr. Jeremy Taylor says, "God can do what he pleases. He can

change or annihilate every creature, and alter their manner or essence.”—*Of the real and spiritual Presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament*, p. 213.

And again, the same Dr. Jeremy Taylor says, “Let it appear that God hath affirmed Transubstantiation, and I, for my part, will burn all my arguments against it, and make public amends.”—P. 240.

After this, gentlemen, I can only say, I, who am not acquainted with the primary, as well as the secondary qualities of matter, which my learned friend has so scientifically argued upon, (should this long list of authorities not satisfy him,) ask him to show me wherein those qualities consist, and I will, should he do so, withdraw all these arguments in favour of Transubstantiation. I have hitherto made statements from the sacred volume which ought to convince you of the verity of Christ's real presence in the sacrament; his own words in that memorable chapter, the 6th of John, ought at this time to be sufficiently impressed on your minds: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.” “For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.” (St. John, vi. 53.) “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” (Id. 56.) Then comes that awful, that solemn oath: “As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.” (Id. 57.) I cannot conceive, gentlemen, stronger language to enforce the doctrine of Transubstantiation. What says he? “This *is* my body, this *is* my blood.” Now, had he meant to say merely, This bread is my body, then it might have favoured the doctrine of Consubstan-

tiation; it would then have been, not *τοῦτο*, but *οὗτος ἄpros*, or “this bread is my body.” But he did not thus speak, and so Transubstantiation is clearly, indubitably proved, unless our blessed Saviour meant to speak orientally, as my friend asserts; if so, the whole question is at an end between us Catholics and Protestants. But as far as the scriptural words go, my reverend opponent must admit that, apart from his oriental imagination, they are in favour of the doctrine to which Roman Catholics still inflexibly adhere.

Now I am put upon orientalism by my learned friend, I must give him some assistance. “It argues,” says the grave Dr. Adam Clarke (in reference to Transubstantiation), “it argues gross stupidity on the part of the Catholic in drawing such a deduction from the words of our Saviour, and it requires something like spiritual acuteness to know what the Saviour meant.” But, my friends, how is the intellect of man to discover orientalism, when it hears, in that divine 6th chapter of John, before the last supper, the blessed Saviour affirm, “Verily, verily, unless ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you?” (Id. 53.) Especially after having told them before that supper, that he would talk to them no more in parables, how is he to deduce from such words that he means still to parabolize? What are we to say to our Divine Master, when he affirms in solemn words before the Last Supper: “The time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs,” St. John xvi.; what, but respond with his own disciples, “Lo! now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverbs,” St. John xvi. 19; thou tellest us what thou meanest, and it is thy flesh which thou givest

us to eat,—it is thy blood which thou givest us to drink. I maintain, therefore, in accordance with all ages, from the day on which our Saviour pronounced these words, these emphatic words, down to the present moment, that the Church of God has uniformly taught that doctrine; and I am prepared to disprove the assertion that Pascasius Radbert was the first who wrote a treatise on Transubstantiation. That he was the first who wrote copiously on the doctrine (as far as ancient manuscripts have come down to us), I readily admit; but Pascasius Radbert himself says, “that he is not writing anything new,—that he is writing on what the world always believed since Christ uttered those words.” The sentence of Pascasius Radbert is, “what is believed and confessed by all the world.” “*Quod totus orbis credit et confitetur.*” (Epist. ad Frudegarum.) These are the words of Pascasius Radbert. He was not preaching any new doctrine, but a doctrine known and professed from age to age before his time. I have here the fathers before Pascasius Radbert. He, I think, wrote in the eighth century, in 754. My learned friend must have forgotten to read his history—his Treatise on Transubstantiation. Now I happen—very unluckily for my learned friend—to have a father in each century from the time of Christ, and if it be needful to prove it, they can be quoted, all resounding as they do most strenuously and most loudly the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

St. Gregory of Nyssa, who flourished in 372, says, “Now we must consider, how it can be possible that one body, for ever distributed to so many myriads of the faithful over the whole world, should be in the distribution whole in each receiver, and should itself remain in

itself whole.” — *St. Greg. Nyss. Catechet. Orat.* vol. iii. Edit. Benedict. p. 102.

Here you see that, in the year 372, the doctrine is spoken of which my reverend friend has endeavoured to impress on you is the invention of Pascasius Radbert, about the eighth century. Such are the inconsistencies of our opponents, when they are confronted by the illustrious fathers of the Church! When they adhere to the Bible they can enforce their own interpretation; but I hope they will leave me the liberty of drawing my deductions from the same hallowed source. I learn from them (the Protestant commentators) that all the Saviour said on this subject was figurative; and it is this same oriental license that induces the Quakers to tell me that the water to be used in baptism is also figurative, and that there is no necessity for baptism. I believe that Calvin asserts the same thing: “Baptism,” he says, “may be demanded as a sign, or a seal; but it is not necessary to salvation.”

According to my friend, you may render everything figurative; anything may be reduced to figure. But I long to know what my learned opponent will say to the following words of Martin Luther. He declares most positively, that, in order to give annoyance to the Pope, he struggled on, day after day, for a long series of years, to do away with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or at least of Consubstantiation. “But,” he says, “the words were too strong; I was inextricably bound in fetters by the words of the gospel, ‘Take, eat, this is my body; and drink, this is my blood.’” To come now to an observation of my reverend friend. He complained bitterly of the Council of Trent, for laying those under an anathema that do not believe in

this sacred doctrine of all ages; but he should recollect that his own Church is equally vehement in its expressions against us, when it declares that we have been “perniciously taught and have *damnable*ly believed.” The learned gentleman endeavoured to soften down and explain away the harsh word “*damnable*,” but he could not do it.

I believe that the Church of England, and the Church of which my rev. friend is a member, both lay down in their Articles, that out of their Church no man can be saved. We soften not only the words, but the drift of them, much more than Calvin does; because we say that no man that leads a pure life, and has had no opportunity of enlightenment, can be lost: we say, it is only obstinate heretics who are condemned; we do not exclude from the pale of salvation those who have no opportunity of enlightening themselves, but only those who have an opportunity; those who are thoroughly convinced that, from age to age, and without interruption, the doctrine of Transubstantiation has been taught by the Church of God, and yet believe it not to be true, and will not come into our Church. Of such we entertain no very sanguine hopes as to their salvation. Gentlemen, before I sit down, I will merely put one more question for my learned friend to answer, viz.—How it happens that, while he announces Transubstantiation to be the product of one of the dark ages, how it happens that the Eutychians and Nestorians, who separated from the Catholic Church about fourteen hundred years since, and who now flourish numerously in the east—how happens it, that they still adhere to the doctrine of Transubstantiation to the present day; and, whilst Protestants call it an error

of the Church of Rome, the Nestorians and Eutychians cry out with one voice, “We received the doctrine of Transubstantiation from the times of the apostles.” This is an argument which all the advocates of the Church of England and Scotland will never be able to answer satisfactorily. It may be attempted, but the answer will be sure to draw upon him that gives it a loud laugh from all the nations of the world. I have read all their doctors, and prime controversialists, and they all endeavour to elude the question. It is, I must confess, one of the most considerable difficulties that I can possibly propose to my learned friend this evening, to give scope to his ingenuity. [Mr. French’s hour here terminated.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—I must confess I had formed a very high estimate of the talents of my learned friend, and was really prepared to hear something like a lucid and conclusive exposition, not only of Transubstantiation, but also arguments in favour of it which it would take time to refute, and ingenuity to repel. This audience is by this time no mean judge both of the number and the weight of the arguments of my learned friend. Let me, in the outset, just touch upon a few of the remarks which he made, and then come more closely to the subject under discussion. Let me, before doing so, correct one misunderstanding. My learned friend said, that the Church of Rome does not assert that none can be saved who are without her communion. I hold in my hand the creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, to which every Roman Catholic subscribes. The last clause of this document is, “This true Catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved.*” Hanc

veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest."

My opponent commenced his discourse by stating, that whilst our Lord was preparing for the celebration of the supper, in the 6th chapter of John, he said, "Unless ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God, ye have no life in you." I shall reply to this when I come to this chapter by-and-by. In the mean time, let me ask, by what authority it is that he makes this chapter refer to the Eucharist? I call on him to explain his reasons for believing that the 6th chapter of John refers to the Lord's supper at all. For my part, I am ready to bring forward proofs and extracts from the most distinguished doctors of the Church of Rome, declaring that it has been a question whether the 54th verse of the 6th chapter of John refers to the Lord's supper at all.

In his next remark, he quoted the Gospel of Luke, 22d chapter, "This is my blood." Now I beg to correct the quotation, if it be taken from Luke. Our Lord's language in that Gospel is not, "This is my blood," but, "*This cup is the new testament in my blood.*" My opponent's next remark was, that he would not give up the fathers. Now I maintain that the fathers give up *him*, again and again; and if he do not give up the fathers, he will have to contend with the most heterogeneous elements, and to cling to sentiments the most contradictory. Nay, I will show that the very fathers, to whom he has referred with such an air of triumph, as favourable to Transubstantiation, contain other passages distinctly and deliberately the *reverse* of Transubstantiation.

Now I stated, at the outset of my remarks, first, that the fathers were not infallible; secondly, that the fathers were never deputed to give

infallible expressions to the Christian faith; and, in the next place, Delahogue, professor of theology at Maynooth, and a laborious advocate of the Church of Rome, distinctly states, "In order that any one may be called by the name of father, it is not required, indeed, that he shall have committed no errors, since St. Justin holds an honourable place among them, who thought that the happiness of the pious dead was to be postponed till the day of final judgment. St. Irenæus, who patronized the error of the Millenarians; St. Cyprian, who believed that the baptism conferred by heretics was to be repeated; moreover, *Origen and Tertullian, who have erred in so many points*, have been constantly reckoned among the fathers."—*Delahogue's Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 3d edit. 1829.

Delahogue has taught hundreds of the Irish priests, that "the fathers have erred in many points." My opponent made another curious remark, viz. that they were fathers and *grandfathers* too. By what logic does he make this out? How can a man be father and grandfather at one and the same time of the same child? If I have a child, I cannot be the father of that child and the grandfather too. Now my solemn and well-weighed conviction respecting the fathers is this,—that they are at best but *second-rate* authorities; that they do not convey unadulterated the pure and the living waters of truth; that they are but "earthen vessels," the waters of which have become more or less tainted after their leaving the fountains of primæval inspiration. I expected my learned friend would have departed from these "earthen vessels," tainted and polluted with all the imperfections of humanity, and have made a manly and deliberate appeal

to those living streams, to which Christ has invited us in language the most earnest and impressive:—"Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters!" and again, "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come;" and again, "Search the Scriptures, for these are they which testify of me." Since, however, he is determined to exhume the fathers, I will for a little follow him.

The first father my learned opponent quoted is St. Ignatius, from whom he extracted a passage in proof of Transubstantiation. He certainly read to you figurative language, which he considers favourable to Transubstantiation. Let me also show how easy it is to neutralize the testimony of Ignatius. Ignatius, in the Epistle to the Trilemans, distinctly disclaims all recognition of Transubstantiation: "Do you, therefore, resuming long-suffering, re-establish yourselves IN FAITH, WHICH IS THE FLESH of the Lord, and in LOVE, WHICH IS THE BLOOD of Jesus Christ;" *εν πιστει η εστι η σαρξ, και εν αγαπη η εστι το αιμα του Χριστου.*

These are the *ipsissima verba* of St. Ignatius. Now I grant that, in the passage quoted by my learned friend, this father holds language expressive of Transubstantiation; but here I quote another passage from the same father, in which he holds distinctly *the reverse*, or gives such an explanation of his language as proves his employment of it to have been figurative, and that he calls the sign by the *thing signified*. But if there be downright contradiction, as my opponent may hold, what must be the inference? That we are to leave the *fathers*, and go to the *grandfathers*, the apostles and evangelists, whose writings are contained in the Word of God. My learned friend tells me that St. Ignatius "stares me in the face." I show that he stares us both in the

face, and that the apostles and evangelists stare Ignatius in the face, if the latter can be saddled with Transubstantiation.

As to my opponent's remark, that Peter was "the rock, or corner-stone," my reply is simply from the word of God: "To whom coming"—speaking of Christ—"as unto a *living stone*, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also, as lively stones; are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;" and St. Paul says, "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (*plural number*)—"Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Yea, the Council of Trent declares that "FAITH" in the truths of the Gospel is the foundation "against which the gates of hell shall not prevail."

My opponent next quoted from Augustine a passage which seems to favour Transubstantiation. Now I treat Augustine as impartially as Ignatius, and I therefore quote a passage from Augustine's 3d book upon "Christian Doctrine," vol. iii. p. 630. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1685: "If a passage is preceptive, and either forbids a crime or wickedness, or enjoins usefulness or charity, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command a crime or wickedness, or to forbid usefulness or kindness, it is *figurative*. Unless ye shall eat, he says, the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you. He appears to enjoin wickedness, or a crime. It is a *FIGURE*, therefore, teaching us that we partake of the benefits of the Lord's passion, and that we must sweetly and profitably treasure up in our memories that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

I next quote from Augustine's

25th Treatise upon the 6th chap. of John, vol. iii. p. 490, (Ed. Ben. Paris, 1685,) "Jesus answered and said to him, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he has sent. *To do this is to eat the flesh which perishes not*, but endures to eternal life. *Why do you prepare your teeth and your stomach?* Believe only, and you will have eaten.'"

One would almost imagine that Augustine anticipates the monstrous dogma of Roman Catholicism. No language can be more contrary to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. My opponent must either admit that his favourite father contradicts himself, or that, by my literal extract, he explains the meaning of the figurative. I quote another to this effect from the same author—*part only* of which my opponent has thought proper to quote: "It seemed a hard saying to them when he said, 'Except any man eat my flesh, he shall not have eternal life.' They received it foolishly, and they meditated upon it carnally, and thought that the Lord was about to cut off certain little pieces from his body and to give them to them; and they said, This is a hard saying. They were hard, and not the saying. For if they had not been hard, but meek, they would have said within themselves, He does not say this for nothing."

These are the words of Augustine on the 98th Psalm, and though any thing but favourable to Transubstantiation, my opponent stopped short at the words, "for nothing," and forgot to quote the rest of the passage, and I will therefore refresh his memory, and do justice to Augustine, by quoting the remainder: "There is some hidden sacrament in it. When his twelve disciples remained with him, the others having departed, they addressed him

as if lamenting their death, because, being offended at his word, they had departed. But he taught them, and said to them, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, they are spirit, and they are life. Understand SPIRITUALLY what I have spoken. YOU ARE NOT ABOUT TO EAT THIS BODY WHICH YOU SEE, and to drink that blood which they shall shed who shall crucify me. I have recommended to you a certain sacrament, which, if spiritually understood, shall quicken you.'" (Ps. xeviii.)

You see how the passages my opponent reads make the other way, if he will allow the father to explain his own meaning. The next remark that my opponent made was to the effect, that Protestants differ from each other in fundamentals. If we exclude from the range of Protestants those who deny the deity of Christ,—and if my friend was present at the discussion at Downside, he may remember that, both on the Protestant and the Roman Catholic side, it was *nem. con.* admitted that Socinians are not Christians—they do not. Socinians are excluded because they deny a fundamental and essential truth; whereas, the Church of Scotland and the Church of England differ in circumstantials, but are agreed in essentials on the great doctrine of the Trinity, on the completeness of the sacrifice of Jesus, on the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit—in all essentials, in short, we are one;—in circumstantials, or non-essentials, I admit we agree to differ. But let me tell my opponent, if he feel at all anxious to alter his position, on hearing a clear confutation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, let him go to any one of the churches or denominations he refers to (Socinianism

excepted), and he will have made a most happy and delightful exchange.

In his next remark he complained most bitterly that I had used language and terms offensive and irreverent, when I spoke of the "bones and the nerves, the body and the blood, the soul and divinity" of our Lord Jesus Christ, being assumed by him to be present on the Roman Catholic altars. Now, the question is, who invented the words? who authorized the use of these words? It was not I. Have I not quoted verbatim from the canons of the Council of Trent, which says the bread and wine are "changed into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Son of God?" Have I not quoted the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which says that the priests are diligently to instruct the people that "the bones and the nerves," the "body and the blood," and "all that belongs to a true body," are really and actually present on the altar? And, therefore, if I have used these offensive and irreverent words, "the bones and the nerves, the flesh and the blood," I have neither invented them nor taken them from any Protestant work. I have used the recognised and authorized documents of the Church of Rome; and I call on my friend, if he pleases, to find fault with the phraseology of his own Church, but not to find fault with me for using her *ipsissima verba*.

My opponent's next remark bore the resemblance of an argument for once, viz. that our Lord came into the midst of his disciples with the doors shut; from which he seemed to infer that our Lord can corporeally and substantially be present in one and two places at one and the same time. He may, says he, have come through the door, the walls, or the window, or some other passage, without the door, the win-

dow, or the wall being broken through. My reply is, Show me, from Scripture, that he either passed through door, window, or wall, without aperture of any kind. He was seen outside the one minute, and inside the other. Is the wafer seen to be bread one minute, and flesh the next? There is no parallel. He appealed to the senses of his disciples, when he stood in the midst of them and said, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," making the senses arbiters of *corporeal* presence: and, therefore, the very passage which my learned friend quotes, to vindicate the doctrine of Transubstantiation, is one of those very passages that triumphantly show that our Lord appeals to the senses for a verdict on his *corporeal* presence.

The next passage quoted by my opponent was, "This is my body," which, says he, denotes, "This is my body." He holds that the moment the priest pronounces these words, *Hoc enim est meum corpus*, the wafer, lying on the altar, is transubstantiated into "the body and blood, soul and divinity, bones and nerves, of the Lord Jesus Christ." With this extraordinary assertion before me, I may have the curiosity to look at the Host, and I see that still it is a piece of paste, or flour and water. I have seen a consecrated wafer in the hands of one of us heretics, and I have examined it minutely, and I could discover nothing but flour and water. "But no," says my opponent, "it is not, you are mistaken: it is actually 'the flesh and blood, the soul and divinity, bones and nerves, of the Son of God.'" Then, if my opponent be correct, what is the result? My senses have deceived me; and if in one point, it may be in a dozen. May not my senses be deceived when I look at Mr. French? Sup-

pose I follow out his own principle, and maintain he has no voice, but only "the accidents" of a voice; that if I were to smite him he would not feel it; that if I were to call him, he would not answer; that if I were to treat him in the harshest manner, I should be doing him no mischief, because he is not present, but has only "the accidents and the species" of presence. But my opponent is substantially present, and is what he looks. So I say of the wafer; it smells like a wafer, it tastes like a wafer, it weighs like a wafer, it corrupts like a wafer,—from first to last, it is precisely a flour and water *wafer*. And, therefore, if my senses do so declare it is a wafer, I cannot deny my senses, any more than when my senses declare that Mr. French, on my left, is my Roman Catholic opponent. I may contradict them, and say it is the Pope, or any "airy nothing," a phantom and a frenzy.

I ask Mr. French if my senses deceive me when I see the wafer on the altar, which, instead of being flesh and blood, I perceive to be mere flour and water—I ask him how he *knows* that the words of the 24th verse of the 11th ch. of 1 Cor. are, "This is my body?" I am at full liberty to say, on Mr. French's principle, that the words of that text are, "These are the bricks with which Babylon was built." He cannot repudiate or deny this statement, for he declares the senses are not to decide; on the contrary, that all five deceive me. If my senses deceive me when I look at the wafer, so my senses may deceive me when I look at the words, "This is my body." I may assert, if Transubstantiation is right, these are the gates of Solomon's temple; these are the bricks with which Babylon was built; this is Nebuchadnezzar's palace; "this is great

Babylon." I have just the same right to say so, as Mr. French has to assert that the wafer that lies upon the altar is the "body and blood, and the soul and divinity, the bones and nerves of the Son of God." On the Roman Catholic principle of interpretation, no member of that Church knows the words to be in the Bible at all. Therefore, if my senses are capable of deception in this matter, the same deception may prevail on every side; and, instead of looking around me on worldly realities, and living in a world of substantial and solid things, I may be the tenant of an "airy nothing," and I myself may be but the baseless fabric of a vision.

But if the senses deceive in this matter, may not the senses have deceived when the Son of God rose from the dead; and the apostles have been utterly cheated, when he said, "Handle me and see, and know that a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have?" May not the senses have deceived all the witnesses of this momentous and cardinal occurrence? If so, Christ may not be risen, and all our preaching is vain; and your faith is in vain, "if Christ be not risen from the dead." May not the infidel take powerful hold of Transubstantiation, and say to my opponent, "You have no evidence that Christ rose from the dead: you admit that your senses are deceived when you look on bread and wine, and that though they protest that this is flour and water, nevertheless they deceive you, for in verity it is flesh and blood;—so the senses of the apostles, when they saw and handled and spoke with Christ, may have been also deceived, and he may not have risen from the dead, and all the history of the resurrection may be but a beautiful romance. Again, with reference to the words

of the institution of the Eucharist, I maintain that the Church of Rome herself *does not adhere to the literal language*. My opponent has talked, in high terms, about my use of the words oriental, figurative, and metaphorical. I can show that the Church of Rome herself, when it suits her purpose to twist a passage, abandons the literal and takes up this figurative, this same oriental, and so much scouted principle of interpretation on my part. These very words, "this is my body," she does not take up *literally*: she says, "this is my body," means, "this is *transubstantiated* into my body;" not even so literally as this, but she says, "this is transubstantiated into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Son of God." And, therefore, instead of taking these words in their literal sense, for which she so strenuously and perseveringly contends, we find that the Church of Rome, in the very passage she quotes as the stronghold of Transubstantiation, departs, because it suits her object, from the *literal*, and assumes the *figurative*; and yet we Protestants alone are guilty of "oriental" interpretations.

But these are not all the orientalisms and figures of which this advocate of *literality* is guilty; for when she comes to interpret the passage, "this cup is the new testament in my blood," the Church abandons her principle, and has recourse to our principle of figurative interpretation. If "this is my body," means, this is transubstantiated into my body and blood, then, by the same process, "this cup is the new testament in my blood," means, this cup is transubstantiated into the new testament, and the cup instantly becomes the New Testament! It is the necessary result of such a plan. If "this is my body,"

means, this is transubstantiated into my body, then "this cup is the new testament in my blood" must mean this cup is transubstantiated into the New Testament. If we take this literal interpretation which is thus contended for,—"*this is my body, this is my blood,*" then let us honestly and impartially carry out the principle through all similar passages of Scripture. Let us maintain this homogeneous interpretation throughout. What then does it lead to? "*I am the true vine,*" said our Lord. Now if he had said, "*this is my true body,*" then, you observe, there would have been stronger ground for the Church of Rome's saying, that it is turned into his very flesh and his blood. He does not say so, however; but he does say, "*I am the true vine.*" Now if the Church of Rome holds that, when our Lord said "*this is my body,*" the bread was turned into flesh, or that he meant "*my flesh,*" then she must hold, by a parity of reasoning, that when Christ said, "*I am the true vine,*" he was really transubstantiated into a vine, whose roots were to strike into the hills, whose boughs were to spread forth over the valleys, and whose branches were to be covered with clusters of ripe and pendant grapes. Now, is the Church of Rome prepared to go this monstrous length? Again, our Lord says, "*I am the door.*" She must be prepared, therefore, to show, either that our Lord was actually transubstantiated into "*a door,*" or to give some decisive reason why she should depart from the literal interpretation.

Again, the Apostle says, "*that rock was Christ.*" The Church of Rome must be prepared to demonstrate that Christ, on her mode of interpretation, was changed into a rock, or to give reasons if otherwise.

Again, Christ said, "The field *is* the world"—"the reapers *are* the angels." Is the Church of Rome willing to adopt the children of her own principle of interpretation, and to assert with consistency, if not with common sense, that the field was transubstantiated into the world, and the reapers into angels? Again, "The seven heads *are* seven mountains," that is, according to this magic process, seven heads were really and actually transubstantiated into seven mountains. Again, "ye *are* the sheep," "ye *are* the branches," and "the seven ears of corn *are* seven years," "the seven candlesticks *are* seven churches."

Of course my opponent, if he insists on the literal interpretation of the words, "this is my body," must insist also on a literal interpretation of all these passages; viz., that our Lord was transubstantiated into "a vine;" that "the seven candlesticks" were transubstantiated into "seven churches;" that "the seven ears of corn" were transubstantiated into "seven years;" that believers were transubstantiated into "sheep," and, anon, into "branches," &c. &c.; and, in short, if his principle be adhered to, and carried out, it will plunge him into the most revolting and disastrous whims that were ever entertained in the imagination of the most wild and irclaimable monomaniac. But, on the other hand, if he admit with me, that "this is my body" means, this represents my body, or is a symbol, or sign of my body, then the interpretation of all the passages I have referred to comes to be most harmonious and beautiful. "Ye are the branches," *i.e.* ye are represented by the branches in their relation to the stem and the root; "ye are the sheep," *i.e.* ye are represented by the various

beautiful characteristics of the habits of sheep; "I am the door," that is, a door is a beautiful symbol or emblem of the way by which, or through which, believers enter into heaven; and, "I am the true vine," *i.e.* I am the supporter, or the nourisher of all those living branches, or believers, who have been grafted on to me by the Holy Spirit. Now then, if the Church of Rome does not hold the literal interpretation of these passages, what must be the inference? that she plays fast and loose with the word of God: when the figurative suits, she adopts it—when the literal interpretation suits her purpose, she keeps it. The fact is, she adopts the *figurative* interpretation in *twenty passages*, and takes the *literal* in *one*. "She strains at a gnat, and she swallows a camel."

Still farther to illustrate the consistency of the Protestant interpretation, suppose I take you to the British Museum: you see, just as you enter the statuary room, a beautiful bust of the celebrated Homer, the finest in the whole collection. I say to you, this is Homer; do you understand that it is the living original? or that it is transubstantiated into the flesh of the blind Mæonian? Again, in the quotation from Isaiah, "all flesh is grass," if the literal interpretation is to be insisted on, I must believe that all flesh is actually and literally grass, and I must believe that my opponent is merely a bundle of grass; and by no means what he actually appears—a substantial and reasonable man, teasing the fathers for those proofs which the apostles, the grandfathers, refuse to give him.

This figurative language is quite usual in the Scriptures, when reference is made to the Jewish Sacraments. For instance, it is said of circumcision, in Genesis xvii. and

10th, "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised." Again, it is declared of the Passover, "this Lamb is the Passover." Now, the word "Passover" literally means the transit of the destroying angel, throughout the length and the breadth of Egypt, when he dealt destruction on all the first-born of the children of the Egyptians, "from the first-born of Pharaoh on the throne, unto the first-born of the captive in the dungeon," and when the first-born of the Israelites, and the children of God, were mercifully spared. When, therefore, the Israelites of old were told of this calamity, and that this lamb was to be slain and sacrificed as a Passover, did they understand that it was no longer a lamb, but *bonâ fide* the angel passing through the length and breadth of Egypt, destroying the first-born of the Egyptians, and sparing the first-born of the Israelites, awakening the helpless wail of Rahab, but causing songs of joy to burst from the dwellings of mercifully-spared and happy Israel? No, every Israelite understood that this lamb was a symbol, a sign, or memorial of the Passover, and *not* that it was actually transubstantiated, and turned into the Passover.

Let me now call your attention to the institution of the Lord's Supper. Our Lord sat at a table, and had just celebrated the Passover, where I have shown you that this figurative language was usual; he took bread, a piece of bread, and looking at his disciples, as you may see faithfully portrayed in the pictures drawn by the artists of the Church of Rome, though these are no proofs—he took bread, and gave thanks, and holding that bread in his hand, he added, "This is my body," and then, taking the cup, he said, "This cup

is the new testament in my blood, shed for many for the remission of sins; drink ye *all* of it. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Now, if the disciples had understood that he gave them his own flesh and blood, from all their past conduct we may safely infer they would have said, "Lord, what does this mean? Thou art sitting at the table, and not giving us thy flesh; thou art speaking to us, and art not 'broken;' thy body is not 'broken into pieces,' but whole, and seated at the table: what does this mean; what are we to understand by this?" "Is it not," they would have said, "forbidden us to drink blood in the rescripts of Levi? May we violate this law?"

Again, if this literal interpretation is to be adhered to, then mark the monstrous absurdities which it necessarily entails:—I must suppose that our Lord, though he was sitting at the table, yet held his body in his hand. I must suppose that our Lord's body was seated at the table, and yet that he gave his whole body to Peter, his whole body to John, his whole body to every one of the twelve who sat with him in the first celebration of the Eucharist. Now, you perceive, it must require an extraordinary amount of scriptural argument to convince one that these most anomalous and most extravagant things actually and circumstantially took place on this occasion.

Again, my opponent made some remarks about what God can do—that "nothing," he said, "is impossible to God," and, therefore, all this may be possible with him. I say, "all things are possible with God," is a scriptural text; but mark you, it is not God's *omnipotence* that is the rule of faith, but

God's *written word*; and moreover, "whilst all things are possible with God," it is also written, "*God cannot lie.*" There are certain things—we speak of it with reverence—that cannot be possible with God; such as that a son should be the father of his father—that is an absurdity, that is not possible; "God cannot lie," is another text for our guidance; but if it be possible that Christ's whole body is contained in every part of the Host at Rome, his whole body in every part of the Host at London, and Christ's whole body in every part of the Host at Paris, then, accordingly, on the same principle, it follows, that Peter may be at Paris, and yet at London—that Peter may set out from Paris to London and meet Peter half-way coming from London to Paris, and should he be startled at meeting himself, he may merely quote Transubstantiation as a parallel case. Peter may be at Paris, at London, and at Rome, and at Edinburgh, at one and the same moment. Peter may sleep in a whole skin at Paris, have a broken leg at Edinburgh, and a broken head in London. He may, at one and the same moment, be feasting in Edinburgh, fasting at Rome, and drunk at Paris. All these contradictions of common sense, reason and experience, and scriptural precedent, are vindicated on the misapplied text, that "all things are possible with God." My opponent said, and said justly, reason is not the arbiter of truth. Now I admit that neither the omnipotence of God, nor the reason of man, is the rule of faith; but the *revealed will, the written word of the Almighty One*: and though reason should recoil from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, though sense should recoil from it, yet if I could see a plain, express, and irrefragable de-

claration in the Word of God, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as defined in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and in the Canons of the Council of Trent, is true. I should say, "Let God be true, and every man a liar;" but I find that this blessed Word of God, when I refer to its parallel passages, and construe them according to the whole analogy of inspiration, declares that these words, "this is my body," which are distorted into the monstrous dogma of the Church of Rome, are a simple and beautiful expression, denoting, this is the symbol, or sign, or representative memorial of my body, which is broken for you. This holy volume asserts that our Lord's body is now glorified, but the Church of Rome says that his body is present on the altar every day, nay, not only present on the altar, but that it is liable to the most awful and horrible outrages that can be perpetrated upon any creature. We say Christ's body is glorified, and far beyond suffering and death, in heaven; but the Church of Rome presumes that she brings down that glorified body, and makes it to be broken again, and the blood to be shed again; and if it be a true body, we might infer, that there must be pain and grief, and other proofs of keen sensibility, during the breaking of the Host, were it not that the Church of Rome shields herself from the charge, by another inconsistency, that there is offering without suffering. To show you the awful degradation to which the Church of Rome conceives the body of Christ to be liable, I quote from the preliminary remarks to the "*Missale Romanum*," entitled "*De Defectibus Missæ*," the authority of which no Roman Catholic dare dispute. It is in Latin, but I will give you it in faithful English:—

On the defect of the Bread.—"If the bread be not of wheat, or if of wheat, it should be mixed with grain of another kind, in so great a quantity that it does not remain wheaten bread, or if otherwise corrupted, the sacrament is not formed.

"If the Host, when consecrated, should disappear, either by some accident, as *by wind*, or *by a miracle*, or *be taken by some animal*, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated."

Defects of the Wine.—"If the wine have become altogether vinegar, or altogether putrid, or be made from sour or unripe grapes, or if so much water has been mixed with it that the wine is corrupted, the sacrament is not formed.

6. "If something poisonous have fallen into the chalice, or what is calculated to excite sickness of the stomach, the consecrated wine is to be placed in another cup, and other wine, with water, is to be placed again to be consecrated."

On defects in the Duty itself.—"If a fly, or a spider, or something else, shall have fallen into the chalice before consecration, let him throw the wine into a suitable place, and place other wine in the chalice; let him mix a little water, offer it as above, and continue the mass; if a fly, or something of the kind, shall have fallen after consecration, and nausea arise in the priest, let him take it out and wash it with wine; at the end of the mass let him burn it, and let the combustion and lotion of this kind be thrown into the sacarium.

7. "If something poisonous shall have touched the consecrated Host, then let him consecrate another, and take it in the way that has been said, and let that be preserved in the tabernacle, in a separate place, until the species be completed.

12. "If, through carelessness, some of the blood of Christ shall

have fallen, if indeed on the earth, or on the board, let it be licked with the tongue, and let the place itself be scraped as much as is sufficient, and let what has been scraped off be burned."

How awful the degradation to which such superstition must subject the body of Christ in the minds of its votaries! The Host, when the words of the priest have been pronounced, "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God,"—an animal may run away with; the wind may blow it away! Yet further, is it not nearly approaching to the "crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to an open shame," when the awful dogma is declared, that the "soul and divinity, the body and the blood" of our Lord Jesus Christ, assumed to be upon the altar of the Church of Rome, a *rat*, or a *mouse*, or a *dog*, may eat up, and "put it once more to an open shame?" Again, it is stated, among the defects which may occur on the part of the minister, as recorded in this "Missale Romanum," "If any one does *not intend* to form, but do something *deceitfully*; likewise, if some Hosts, from forgetfulness, remain on the altar, or some part of the wine or some Host is concealed, when he does not intend to consecrate any but those which he sees; likewise, if any one have before him *eleven* Hosts, and intends to consecrate only *ten*, not determining which are the ten he intends, in these cases he does not consecrate, because *intention* is required."

The last is illustrated by a reference to a canon of Trent, which declares *intention* to be essentially requisite in the administration of all the sacraments.

Now, observe,—the Church of Rome says, if the priest, when he consecrates the Host, does not

"*intend*" to do it, then there is no Transubstantiation; it remains flour and water. Then mark the perilousness of such a doctrine! Suppose the priest should be an infidel at heart, the poor Roman Catholic flock are giving the worship of "*latría*," the supreme worship, to a piece of flour and water, even on their own principle, instead of to the living God. I will show you, by an instance at hand, that this is not rare. The Rev. Mr. Nolan, now a minister of the Church of England, and formerly a priest of the Church of Rome, stated, that during his ministry he could not bring his mind to believe, and *did not* believe, that the flour and the water were turned into the flesh and blood of the Son of God. Then what must be the consequence? Why, all the Roman Catholic hearers of his chapel, who took the sacrament of the altar at his hands, have given "the supreme worship" to a piece of flour and water, instead of God, and had no Mass during his ministry. Such are some of the monstrous and extraordinary consequences which this doctrine necessarily involves. This is not all. I read again from the "*De Defectibus*," v. 14:—"If the priest vomit forth the Eucharist; if the species appear entire, let them be reverently taken, unless nausea arise, for in that case, let the consecrated species be carefully separated, and let them be replaced in some sacred place until they are corrupted, and afterwards let them be thrown into the *sacrarium*. But if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned, and the ashes be thrown into the *sacrarium*." I read them—not to ridicule the Roman Catholics; God forbid! I read them—not to cast one untrue or random aspersion on my Roman Catholic countrymen: but as it is my painful duty—to show the mon-

strous consequences, the blasphemous results, to which the dogma of Transubstantiation necessarily and inevitably leads. If I were quoting these extracts from documents drawn up or worded only by Protestants, or even composed by private doctors, not recognised by the Church of Rome, I should not lay stress on them; I should class them amongst the wild, extravagant vagaries of hermits, monks, and infatuated men: but when I find these statements in the "*Missale Romanum*," admitted and acted on by every Roman Catholic priest, and by my learned opponent, then I do say that the guilt of those dreadful and awful consequences is to be fathered on the Church of Rome and her doctrine of Transubstantiation.

The next subject to which I call your attention (for I have very little time left) is the sixth chapter of St. John, from which my opponent has quoted these words:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." That, I admit, is very strong, but most Protestant language. Now let us see what one of the most distinguished individuals of the Church of Rome says about it; I refer again to Bellarmine on the 54th verse of the sixth chapter of St. John. Bellarmine enumerates several Roman Catholic doctors, who give the Protestant interpretation of this text, while Can. 1, Sess. of Trent, declares that there "*are various interpretations of the holy fathers*." So much for unanimity! In Bellarmine's number of those who give the Protestant interpretation, are Gabriel, Nicolas Cusan, Thomas Cajetan, Richard Tapper, John Hessel, Cornelius Jansenus; Roman doctors, who admit in plain and explicit terms the Protestant inter-

pretation of the passage, viz., that faith or coming to Christ is all that is meant by "eating his flesh and drinking his blood." Now, in reference to the 6th chapter of John, let me repeat my call on Mr. French to prove that it refers to the Lord's supper at all. It is his business to prove an affirmative, it is not my province to prove a negative.

In the next place, what can be more natural than that our Lord, in discoursing with the unconverted inhabitants of Capernaum, who followed because of "the loaves and the fishes," should take occasion to speak of faith in him in a figurative manner; just in the same way as when he met the woman of Samaria at the well; when she came to draw water, he instantly began to speak to her of that "living water, of which whoso drinketh thirsteth no more." More over, if the 6th chapter of John is to be referred to the Lord's supper, then I ask the Church of Rome, what explanation she gives of the fact of her having taken a portion of the sacrament, namely, the cup, from the laity, with the announcement in this chapter before her, that "unless ye eat the flesh AND drink the blood of the Son of God, ye have no life in you." Does the Church of Rome give the cup to the laity? Does she allow her poor devotees to drink the blood of the Son of God? If my opponent reply, the blood is contained in the flesh, I answer, the language (and my opponent is a stickler for literality) is, "*drink my blood.*" Professing and protesting that the 6th chapter of John relates to the Eucharist, and with these words clearly written: "unless ye eat my flesh and *drink my blood,*" yet she withholds the *sine qua non* of salvation. Again, if my opponent says this passage refers to the Lord's supper, then

the consequence is, that every man who eats the flesh of the Son of God, or in other words, partakes of the sacrament of the supper, *has eternal life.* Observe the expression, "Whoso,"—any man (54th verse), "whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." But if eating the flesh and drinking the blood means taking the sacrament of the supper, then every one, whatever his weakness of faith, his unbelief, his previous disposition or preparation—every one, whatever he may be, who "eats and drinks the flesh and blood of the Son of God, has, *ex necessitate rei*, eternal life;" and, therefore, as Judas "ate the flesh and drank the blood" of the Son of God, he, the traitor and the suicide, has eternal life; and every murderer who can run from his victim to the Eucharist secures eternal life. My opponent insists on the literal: let it be so, and the consequences lie with him. Again, we read in verse 53, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God, ye have no life;" *ergo*, no one can be saved unless he partake of the Eucharist. Did the thief upon the cross, in this sense, eat the flesh of the Son of God? The Church of Rome will admit with me, that he, without ever having received the Eucharist, was saved and admitted into glory. Yet the 53d verse, as understood by Romanists, is absolute:—"Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God, ye have no life." Infants, who die after baptism, according to the Church of Rome, are saved; but infants do not "eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of God;" and therefore, if this passage is referred by my opponent to the Lord's supper, he must differ from his Church, and hold that infants, though baptized, yet not having eaten the flesh of

the Son of God, have no life. These are not all the extravagant results of referring this chapter to the communion. Our Lord says (verse 41), "I am the bread which came down from heaven;" and that bread he calls his flesh. Now mark, "it came down from heaven;" but did our Lord's flesh come down from heaven? No: it came from the Virgin Mary. But this flesh which is given us is described as having come down from heaven, and therefore, the passage cannot refer to his literal humanity. Though I am not bound to present an explanation of the chapter, yet as our Lord expounds his meaning, I may refer to it. Verse 35:—"He that *believeth* in me shall never thirst." Verse 35:—"He that *believeth* in me hath everlasting life." Verse 47:—"He that *cometh* to me shall never hunger." "No man *cometh* unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him," and, lastly, I call your special attention to the key of the whole chapter (63d verse): "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the FLESH PROFITETH nothing: the WORDS," says our Lord, "that I speak unto you, THEY are SPIRIT, and THEY are LIFE." Now, I feel sure you are prepared to coincide with me, that all these extraordinary and contradictory results must ensue, as I have enumerated, viz. that every one who partakes of the Eucharist is saved, and that no one is saved who does not, &c.; or that you are to attach to them a *spiritual meaning and import*, and that our Lord was using figurative language, to which he had accustomed his disciples before, when he said that "a man must be born again." When we adopt the Protestant principle, all is beautiful harmony. Christ was that rock: that is, we rest on him, and are sustained by him; as by a rock.

Christ is "the living water:" that is, faith in him is full of refreshment. Again, Christ is described as bread, and we are nourished by it. Believers are set forth as "being born again," "growing in grace," and "members of his body," to denote the close sympathy they realize from communion and fellowship with him. Would Roman Catholics read their Bibles more, they would see that the whole chapter is in keeping with the rest of our blessed Lord's discourses; and that this chapter does not refer to the Lord's supper as a specific institution, but to those truths of which the Lord's Supper is the seal and symbol. I now call on my opponent to demonstrate, by such scriptural and satisfactory reasons as this audience shall be contented with—not flat *ipse dixit*—that the 6th chapter of John is descriptive of the Lord's supper. When he has tried this, and complacently satisfied himself, I next call on him for an explanation of those consequences which necessarily result from such an application of this chapter, viz. that every one who eats the Eucharist is saved, and that no one is saved who does not; and I call on him to prove how it is, that this "bread which *came down* from heaven" can be the flesh of the Son of God, which the Bible teaches us was taken from the Virgin Mary. "Not discerning the Lord's body," cannot surely imply the presence of Christ's flesh and blood? If taken as translated, I ask, do the Roman Catholics "discern" that body on the altar?—[The rev. gentleman's hour here expired.]

MR. FRENCH.—My learned and rev. opponent has pursued precisely the course which I anticipated, and which I specifically predicted to-night, viz. that he would occupy the greatest portion of his time in giv-

ing us his peculiar, his own infallible interpretation of those texts which he quoted from the New Testament. But the grand arguments by which I have proved the existence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation from age to age—these, I contend, remain not only totally unanswered, but totally unalluded to. In the course of my address to you, at the present moment, though I had intended principally, to expatiate most amply on the 6th chapter of John, and then to demonstrate to you, that our blessed Lord and Saviour meant literally to give us his body and his blood,—I say that was my original intention; but as I have been accused by my learned friend of a little incoherence in my first address to you, I shall be particularly careful, at the present moment, to observe a strict line of adherence to regularity and order; so that I cannot wander much, at least in the estimation of my reverend opponent, if I follow him step by step, and answer him paragraph by paragraph. The first observation which the learned gentleman made was in reference to our Church, where I maintained that the Catholic Church does not, as it has been falsely accused by its calumniators, damn all those who differ from her in opinion on religious subjects; but those only who are hardened and disobedient,—who refuse to admit the rays of divine light; in one word, those who are not invincibly ignorant. Why does the learned gentleman endeavour to falsify my assertion, by stating that the creed of Pope Pius positively excludes from the possibility of salvation those who are out of the true Church? Why, I grant, in one respect, that it does so, and we believe that creed to be true: but that creed does not enter into a particular exposition of the various circumstances by which it must necessarily be modi-

fied; it only lays down the broad principle, just as in the Testament, our blessed Saviour, in the Evangelist, says, “He that believeth shall be saved;” and, “He that believeth not shall be damned.” When it is said, in the New Testament, “he that believeth shall be saved,” does not my reverend opponent agree with me, that a man may believe, but, if he pass his life in vice and in iniquity, he may be lost, whatever may be the strength of his belief? The Gospel upon this point only lays down the broad principle, and so does the Church of Rome. The learned gentleman asks, by what authority I pronounce that St. John the Evangelist, in that divine 6th chapter, refers to Transubstantiation—refers to the flesh and to the blood of Christ? Why, that authority by which the learned gentleman interprets for himself, but which he denies to the Roman Catholic, appropriating it, as he does, solely to the Protestant, namely, of using my own spiritual penetration or acumen in reading the Holy Scriptures. I take the chapter in hand this evening, neither as a Catholic, nor as a Protestant, but as a man endowed with the powers of pursuing a train of common argument, and common reasoning. And what is the result? If I take it up with a mind free from prejudice, and in the application of common sense, I solemnly declare that I come to this conclusion, in the exercise of those faculties with which the Almighty has endowed me,—I come to this inevitable conclusion: that it is all an idle and an empty waste of words, a most absurd squandering of speech, a most enormous abuse of language, if Christ does not mean to give me his “flesh to eat, and his blood to drink.” It is perfectly intelligible from beginning to end, without any recourse to metaphor.

My faculties may not be so vigorous by nature, so acute in conception, or so perfect in memory, as those of my learned friend; but I give you the conclusion that I come to in this their exertion,—and that is my authority. But is not this my conclusion firmly backed by the opinions and authorities of men fully equal, as to all the powers of penetrative genius, to my reverend opponent? Have I not with me some of the greatest men that adorn the annals of history, drawing the same identical deduction from that chapter? Have I not men of the most brilliant capacity and sound judgment, who disbelieved Christianity, and only looked at this chapter as a matter of curiosity and interest, and who, the moment that they read it, exclaimed, What advantage must not the Papist necessarily have over his Protestant antagonist, when he confronts him with this chapter? What can be said in the way of rationality to do away this strength of evidence in favour of the Catholic? Why, all that can be said and shown on the subject is such a train of shallow argument as my learned friend has had recourse to this evening. For instance, “I am the door,” “I am the vine,” and so on. What analogy do we find here? Had there been any possibility of their thinking he meant to speak literally here, they would have cried out on that occasion, “How can this man be a door and a vine,” as they did when he said, “Verily, verily, this *is* my flesh, this *is* my blood?” But what authority, you ask, have we for stating that that 6th chapter was the foundation on which to ground the sacrament of the Eucharist? I answer, that our Lord, in my conception of things, was then preparing the minds of his disciples to receive that mysterious *dogma*, which has been

the belief of harmonizing millions for so many centuries,—the doctrine of Transubstantiation. I therefore spurn the question with ineffable disdain, and come to my own deduction, deliberately made by exercising my reasoning faculties, and solemnly declare that that man must voluntarily distort his own faculties, who maintains that the Saviour did not mean in that chapter to impress upon his disciples that his intention was to give them “his own flesh to eat, and his blood to drink.” St. Austin tells you that “the carnally-minded Jews understood it ‘as flesh sold in the market;’” but we do not for a moment mean it in that way—not dead and inanimate flesh, but the body quickened and animated by his immortal soul, and by his eternal, almighty, and life-giving Spirit. The learned gentleman throws ridicule upon it, at the same time that he declares it to be his wish to avoid every expression bordering on offence to the Catholic. And yet the reverend gentleman cannot but know that nothing can be more galling to a Catholic, than to hear the Sacrament contemptuously spoken of, and called a *wafer*. Does he meet in our books with any thing of the wafer? Is that a known or familiar phrase in use among Catholics? The learned gentleman goes on then to state,—for I follow him from the beginning, step by step,—he goes on to state, that the fathers are not infallible. What then! Catholics acknowledge that they are not infallible. There was no necessity whatever for wasting time and breath on a subject of this nature; all we want to know is this: whether there is to be found an harmonious consent between them on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Let us investigate: and to begin, what says the great St. Augustine on this subject? I shall not quote the

Latin, as I wish to make the most of my time. (*St. Aug. contr. Adv. Legit. et Prophet.* lib. ii. cap. 9, vol. viii. p. 599.) "As we receive, with a faithful heart and mouth, the Mediator of God and of men, Christ Jesus, who tells us that *his body is to be eaten, and his blood is to be drunk*; although it may appear more horrible to *eat the flesh of a man* than to destroy it, and to *drink human blood* than to shed it. Again, they (some of the Jews) were converted: they were converted and baptized. They approached to the table of the Lord, and now, *believing, they drank that blood* which, in their ungovernable fury, they themselves had shed."

Now, gentlemen, methinks my facetious orientalist is preparing already to open his ears to take advantage of it, [laughter.] "Christ took earth from earth, inasmuch as flesh is from earth, and this flesh he took from the flesh of Mary; and, because he conversed with us in the flesh, he gave us this same flesh to eat for our salvation. . . . *But no one eats that flesh without adoring it first*;—not only is it no sin to adore it,—but we sin if we adore it not." (*St. Aug. Enarr. in Psalm.* Opera, Bened. Edit. vol. iv. pars 2.)

Is not now my reverend friend prepared to banish St. Augustine from the code of Calvin, when he addresses the consecrated bread, and adores Christ in the Sacrament? Will he admit him to be a member of his Church? Is it not high time that he should anathematize St. Augustine, as being idolatrous in the object of his worship? If I am not mistaken, we shall hear very little from the works of St. Augustine on future occasions, quoted by my reverend opponent. With regard to the "bones and nerves of the Son of God," a subject to which the reverend gentleman alluded, I acknowledge it is in

the Council of Trent; I acknowledge that the words are used; but why endeavour to bring the whole subject into ridicule? If this be permissible in his treatment of a subject so awful, let him reflect whether the sanction of his example will not afford justification for ridicule to the followers of Carlisle, and all those men who blaspheme Christianity? When he sets the example, will they not be quite ready to follow? Again, then, the reverend gentleman alluded to our Saviour appearing in the midst of his disciples, when the doors were shut; but can the learned gentleman possibly account for the appearance of our Saviour after he had been dead? Can the learned gentleman tell me by what transcendant miracle it was that our blessed Lord was transfigured? If he cannot tell me how it was he appeared in the midst of his disciples when the doors were shut; and if he cannot, we are not bound to give him an answer when he asks us, how the Lord of heaven and earth is received by the faithful in every region of the globe, or how he appears at the same time on all our altars. All we know is, that we have his unerring word for it:—"this *is* my body, this *is* my blood." The apostles were bidden to do the same, "in remembrance of him;" that is, to consecrate as he consecrated. They consecrated after him—as I am prepared to prove when that subject is discussed—the successors of the apostles consecrated successively after them, the consecration has been going on from apostolic times to the present day, and all the nations of the earth cry out with one voice in testimony of the sacred fact. The learned gentleman gravely pretends to prove that it interferes with God's government,—those are

his words, which I do not well comprehend; but I ask what he can easily comprehend—viz. how he accounts for this harmonious consent of nations, for that tradition which is uninterruptedly handed down from age to age. I challenge him to answer me,—When did Transubstantiation arise in the world—when was the doctrine first preached? Sometimes he tells us that it was in the eighth century, and that Pascasius Radbert wrote the first treatise on it. But I have already told him that Pascasius only wrote copiously, on what others had written less extensively. I wish it to be thoroughly elucidated this night, and I shall now proceed to give you my ideas on that divine sixth chapter of John, and leave you to draw your own inference from our respective interpretations, so soon as you shall have heard me. This, then, is what I am most desirous to hear thoroughly elucidated,—to know which is the primitive doctrine, the primitive religion,—the body and the blood, or mere bread and wine? I find that England was converted to Christianity in the sixth century. Was the doctrine of Transubstantiation brought over by those holy, those immortal men, who came to rescue this island from the depths of blasphemy and idolatry? Was Protestantism, or was Catholicity believed by those sainted, those illustrious men—by St. Augustine and others? Read the monuments of antiquity to ascertain the truth of it; look at the letters of Gregory the Great, which are still quoted in many of your histories; look at the letters of Gregory the Great, I say, bidding Augustine to wear the pall during the celebration of Mass; look at all the histories which inform us on the subject; look at the Protestant Dean Milner, in his

History of the Church: he tells you that St. Austin brought over all those usages and practices, which are known and adhered to in the Roman Church; and will any one deny that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was likewise included? I would, moreover, ask this question:—Did Protestants introduce Christianity into every nation of the earth? Read, again, upon this point, the pages of your own historian, Milner, and you will find that in every age the only way in which he proves the visibility and the sanctity of the Church, in the six first centuries, in the seventh, eighth, nay in the ninth, is by bringing forward on the scene some illustrious Catholic saints; for there were no Protestants in existence to attract his notice. I say, therefore, here I must fling back the compliment to my reverend antagonist; when he opposes me with the Gospel, the Gospel “stares him in the face”—the Gospel cries out loudly for the doctrine of Catholics. I think the rev. gentleman himself will not hesitate to acknowledge, that, as far as the literality of the words go, it is in our favour. All that the learned gentleman can do or say, is to draw a fine and figurative distinction from all these passages. The words, I have before said, are strong, aye, infrangibly strong, strong enough to delude, if we Catholics labour under error, many centuries, to believe in Transubstantiation; strong enough to make those “fallible” fathers, as my opponent calls them,—and I acknowledge they are fallible,—to make them all with one voice agree that Christ did not intend to be understood figuratively, but literally, and that he meant in reality his flesh and his blood. St. Maruthus, who wrote in the Syriac language, says, “Christ called it not

the *figure* of his body, but said, this *is* my body, this *is* my blood." The learned gentleman then introduces another subject, which I defer to the end, until I have answered some remarks of his, taken, if I mistake not, from Dr. Adam Clarke. Dr. Adam Clarke, I believe, from whom my learned friend has culled all those ingenious passages, such as, "I am the door," "I am the vine," came into contact, some years ago, as I dare say my friend very well remembers, with a most powerful giant in polemics of our Church, of the name of Dr. Wiseman. Dr. Adam Clarke, who brought up all those strange objections against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was, as it appeared, not quite satisfied with the long string of parabolic expressions, such as, "I am the door," "I am the vine," &c. &c.; but he thought to overturn the doctrine of Transubstantiation, by declaring, that our blessed Lord and Saviour said, "This *is* my body, this *is* my blood," because, forsooth, there was such a penury of expression in the language in which he spoke—that there was no word to express the idea, "this is figurative of, this is representative of, or this stands for my body," and that therefore our blessed Saviour, according to him, was necessitated to have recourse to, in order to express his meaning, the substantive "to be," and said, "This *is* my body, this *is* my blood." This accordingly was soon spread all over England, and the Rev. Mr. Horne, who had written rather a virulent pamphlet against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, immediately took up, and disseminated far and wide, the grand discovery. Protestants naturally enough began to say, "Now we can account for the belief of those poor deluded Roman Catho-

lies in Transubstantiation; now, at least, they surely will see that our Lord and Saviour meant to convey the idea, that it was to be representative of his body; surely this is sufficient to open the eyes of those poor, benighted Roman Catholics." Well, my friends, what did Dr. Wiseman do in the midst of the tumult? Why he proved, demonstratively, that so far from that language labouring under any penury of expression as to painting the idea in question, that it was the most potent, the most copious language ever spoken by the mouth of man; that there were actually *forty-one* modes of expressing that idea in that very language, all of which he has written down, and presented to the learned, and all the learned have approved of them, and have declared, that Dr. Adam Clarke is *wrong*; that he had no ground, no right to make the assertion,—in one word, that it was rank imposture practised on the British public.

But what did the followers of Dr. Adam Clarke say? What did the Rev. Mr. Horne say? Why, in the next pamphlet that he published, he artfully omitted the matter, without ever making the least apology for the thousands of Christians whom he had been deluding by such a false, though plausible argument. *Forty-one* well-proved words to express this idea! many more one might introduce likewise, but there were *forty-one*, most fittingly squaring with the expression of the idea. Subsequently, as a *dernier ressort* on the part of the baffled theologians, Dr. Lee, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, and of the oriental languages, was applied to, who delivered his opinion that Dr. Wiseman was undoubtedly right; that there were so many un-

contested words to correspond to the expression of the sentiment; that it was a copious language, instead of being one, as Dr. Adam Clarke wished to insinuate, destitute of phrases to express common ideas. I am sorry to make an observation of this kind on a learned man; but when that learned man calls Catholics "the most stupid of mortals," and wonders, to use his own expression, "how we can believe such a *congeries* of absurdities as the dogmas of our creed, I cannot refrain from exclaiming—Thus it is, my friends, that, in the nineteenth century, the enemy of Catholicity retires to his gloomy cell, in order to forge a new thunderbolt against the immortal *dogma* of Transubstantiation, and comes out of it, if I may use a poetical simile, on the occasion, like Salmoneus, glittering and flashing for awhile, and dazzling all eyes with the mimic splendour of his invention, till at length the "*non imitabile fulmen*" of a Wiseman dashes the impostor to the ground, and exposes him to every eye, an object of pity, of derision, and contempt! But what has he in reality done? Why he has given an additional strength to the argument of Transubstantiation; he has adorned it with a greater lustre than that with which it ever shone before. Again, he little knew, also, that, in urging such an argument against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he was aiding, materially aiding the Unitarians in their views of our doctrine as to the divinity of Christ. If such a theory had once been admitted into modern theology, in the schools of Calvin or Luther, the Unitarian would immediately have exclaimed, "In the beginning *was* the word, and the word *was* with God, and the word *was* God,"—he would then have said, according to your

doctrine, "*was* God," means "the representative of God," and nothing else; and he would have thus argued much more plausibly and felicitously than Dr. Adam Clarke urged his argument, inasmuch as, in St. Paul's epistles, Christ is called *the image* of God. Yes, he would have afforded a strong argument by which the Unitarians might fortify themselves with redoubled obstinacy in their unbelief. The learned gentleman has insinuated—and it is a stale argument used by the divines of the Church of England, though not so usual now as in former days, that adoring Christ in the Eucharist overturns the chief evidence of Christianity, which is the senses.

But the learned gentleman should know, if he has read the fathers, as I am sure he has—he should know, that almost all the fathers have alluded to the frequency with which our senses are deluded, and to that frequency with which in the Bible we find they have been deluded. We read of it in Luke xxiv. 16, 31: "But their eyes were holden, that they should not know him." Again, "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight." Again, St. John, xx. 14—16:—"And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master." Again, St. Matthew, xxviii. 9: "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And

they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him." Again, St. John, ii. 18: "Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?" Then, when "Jacob wrestled with the angel," were not his senses deceived? But I say, in answer to the learned gentleman, that I would much rather disregard my senses than disbelieve the words of the Omnipotent God. *His* word cannot deceive me, my senses may possibly be deceived, *are* frequently deceived; nay, in common material life they are deceived. The eye is frequently deceived: put a stick in the water that is straight, and it will appear crooked; the senses can be deceived.

The learned gentleman, in his sterility of anything like solid argument against us, has endeavoured to draw an argument from the pictures painted by Roman Catholic artists of the Church of Rome, where the Saviour is looking up. But that does not furnish any argument as to the posture of the Saviour at the last supper. The artist, whoever he may be, can know nothing on that awful subject, except that Christ was seated at a table, with his twelve disciples, and took bread and blessed it, and did not say, "this is the *figure* of my body," as St. Marthus observes, but "this *is* my body, this *is* my blood." And I would rather believe his divine word, than believe the infallibility of my senses. But I am astonished that the learned gentleman should have inquired into our doctrine of the Eucharist so superficially. I do not mean to say that he is superficial in any of the branches of learning, except in the tenets of my own Church. As to these, I must own, and sure I am that the learned gentleman will not contradict me, he has manifested some degree of ignorance this night;

and I believe, that if I were called on to explain all the *novum argumentum congeries* of ideas in Calvin's Catechism, I should be much more ignorant. But in order that he may have more solid ground to go upon, I shall prove to him that the *species*, or the *host*—that is the proper word, and not "*wafer*"—after the words of consecration, become really the body and blood of our Lord: that is, they become our blessed Lord's body, soul and divinity, and that the blessed Lord of heaven and of earth in this sacrament is not liable to those outrages, those corporeal contingencies of which he has so feelingly complained.

Good God! such a strain of argument is really astonishing! It gives an opportunity to Deists to ridicule the whole fabric of the Christian religion. It might be said by them, if you believe Christ to have been thus liable to accident, and that he was "truly God and truly man," how was it that, when a little child going into Egypt, he was secure from accident? Suppose a wild beast of the desert had darted upon him and devoured him? Let me tell you, my friends, if the Lord of heaven and earth is where the Host is supposed to be, he is as able to protect himself now by his own divinity, as he was when in the arms of Mary and of Joseph. We find even a poet, St. Thomas Aquinas, who wrote long before the Reformation, who wrote long before Protestants arose to declaim against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, expressing in that immortal hymn, which Sir Walter Scott says "is one of the finest that ever flowed from the pen of man," expressing himself on the subject with more accuracy than my theological opponent. He will inform my learned friend on this subject. It is not for the sake of my poetry, or mode of translating it,

but it is for the sake of the accurate explication it contains, that I take the liberty of reading it to the learned gentleman as a kind of theological lesson. Speaking of Transubstantiation, he says—

“Unshaken tenet! sacred creed!
Enroll'd in faith's eternal deed,
Unchang'd by Time's all-changing flood!
Bread turns to flesh, wine turns to blood!
What far transcends the mind of man,
With all its pow'rs to sound or scan:
What to the eye of mortal shroud,
Seems one impenetrable cloud,
Is clear'd by faith's bright beaming eye,
Though Nature and her laws defy.

What lies before the visual rays
Is but appearance—Faith displays
The glorious form, what signs conceal,
The vivid eyes of faith reveal.
Whate'er th' incredulous may think,
The flesh is food, the blood is drink.
Yes, Christ is in each species whole,
Body, Divinity, and Soul!

Whoe'er this sacred feast partake,
Their food they neither cut nor break,
Nor yet divide;—but oh! admire!
East guest receives it whole entire!
Let one alone, let millions eat,
Alike each takes the self-same meat.
This way, and that, though crowds repair,
Each owns an undiminish'd share.

The good, the bad, alike are fed;—
Oh! how unlike the self-same bread
In the sweet graces it bestows!
'Tis death to these, 'tis life to those.
Death to the bad its sources give,
The good partícipate and live.
Behold what sweets, what bitters flow
From the same fountain, bliss or woe.

Whene'er the sacrament is broken
'Tis but fraction of a token;
Let not then firm faith be shaken,
But remember what is taken!
That in each fragment there remains
Whate'er th' unbroken whole contains.
A sign, that in the hands is borne,
No substance is asunder torn;
No; that which symbols represent,
Is undiminish'd, is unrent;

Lo! then the bread of angels made
Th' ethereal food for sons of shade;
The sons of earth, like sons of heaven,
Eat bread of true celestial leaven;
Sweet food that never knows decay,
Of mortal man the prop and stay,
To dogs not to be cast away,
This sacred mystery to unfold,
Was Isaac sacrific'd of old;
'Tis this the paschal lamb foreshow'd,
For this from heav'n the manna flow'd.”

Now to these verses I call the learned gentleman's attention, that he may now know how to reason

for the future more correctly, more substantially, when he touches upon this hallowed, this mysterious subject. Two of them I shall repeat, in order to shew that the poet is a sound theologian, if St. Gregory of Nyssa, who wrote nearly five centuries before Pascasius Rhadbert, knew anything of the matter, viz.

“That in each fragment there remains
Whate'er th' unbroken whole contains.”

—*Letter to St. Gregory of Nyssa,*
A.D. 372.

St. Greg. Nyss. Catechetica Orat.
vol. iii. Edit. Bened. p. 122: “Now we must consider how it can be possible that one body, for ever distributed to so many myriads of the faithful, over the whole world, should be in the distribution whole in each receiver, and should itself remain in itself whole.”

The learned gentleman continued:—The reverend gentleman says, as if it were a concession, that all things are possible with God, yet in the very same breath he limits the power of God, and declares that reason insists that Transubstantiation is not possible to God. I do not say he has uttered those very words, but his reasoning tended to that point to-night, notwithstanding all these learned men I have quoted have declared that it is possible. Luther does not believe it to be Transubstantiation, but he maintains *consubstantiation*; that Christ is there—that the bread remains there; and the Catholic believes Transubstantiation. But what kind of rule of faith must that be among Protestants, I ask, when the father of Protestantism, Luther, thus explicitly states his opinion, and when all other Protestants of the present day, men and women among you, take the Bible in hand, and are enabled to draw their own inference, one saying that it is purely spiritual,

that Christ is not there, and that they are merely taking it in remembrance of his death and passion, another, that it is his body together with the bread? What kind of rule of faith is that which says, "the Bible without tradition?" what kind of rule of faith can that be, where the Protestants of this country differ, as I have said, on such fundamental tenets? where we find Calvin positively excluding, by a merciless decree, Protestants of the Church of England from the kingdom of heaven, as he does the Catholic? [In consequence of a murmur, Mr. F. said, That is Calvin's Catechism.] Those are his own words, and I can prove it. Well, but what I wish to know is, if the words of Christ are so plain, how is it that a man of Luther's acuteness and discrimination was unable to draw a figurative deduction? That is the point I wish the learned gentleman to answer.

Again, to come a little to tradition. Let not the learned gentleman spend his time in quibbling on particular passages, and introducing parallels where no parallels exist; but let him grapple with me at once like a genuine theologian, and tell me how it is that Transubstantiation arose in the world? Does he deny that I can deduce it, in regular succession, from age to age? He quotes another passage from St. Ignatius, to do away with that ever-memorable extract. But what says it? Why it proves only that Ignatius uses some figurative expressions afterwards, which, as he conceives, totally annihilate the great original. Why, in the Evangelist St. John, we see the very same definition given of God, namely, "God is love;" but it is not to be taken literally, and it is just the same when St. Ignatius happens to say "the Sacrament is love." Now, if you tie me to the literality, then I

say, love is God, since the Evangelist affirms that God is love. Again, when it is said that "God is love," is that to reduce the Supreme Ruler of the universe to the level of the Lucretian god, who exercised of old so great a dominion over the whole heathen world? Is it to do that? No; and if the sentiment is not implied in the expression of the Evangelist, neither is it in that of St. Ignatius, when he says "the Sacrament is love."

The Catholic feels and knows that it is "love"—ay, unbounded love, when he comes,—after having approached with a pure heart, and abstaining from all that is irreverent and all that is impure in thought, in word, and in deed—when he comes away, after having approached that holy, that consoling table—when he comes away from it, oh! I would appeal to my Catholic brethren, if they do not feel their hearts glowing with an unbounded and ineffable love for their blessed and adorable Saviour—their sweet Redeemer! We believe most firmly that Scriptural doctrine; and if we labour under a deception as to the doctrine, I exclaim again—for I cannot repeat it too frequently—let any of our learned theologians of the nineteenth century point out the time when it first arose in the world; the time, I say, when men were first deluded by conspiring priests. If they can do it, we will then acknowledge that we have been labouring under gross delusion and error. But he talks of the "perilousness of the doctrine," on the supposition that our Lord is not there. I see no danger at all. There is no idolatry in it, even if the Host is not consecrated. I am adoring Christ, whom I believe to be there. The Host is consecrated, as the reverend gentleman knows it is, and I believe Christ to be there.

You cannot, you tell me, conceive this. Can you conceive the way in which the Holy Ghost appeared in the form of a dove? I ask you, was it tangible, was it matter? You will, of course, reply no; and therefore I say, that in our sacrament, which we call the Eucharist, the bread, which has all the properties of bread after the words of consecration are pronounced, is no longer bread; but according to our doctrine, Christ, our Saviour, is there in the Sacrament. Here the learned gentleman, in the uncontrolled exercise of his reason, calls us idolaters in adoring this. Why, the Unitarian calls you idolaters for adoring Christ as God, they believing him to be only man. The Unitarian and Socinian say so. But a man, quite as learned as my reverend friend, and gifted with at least as much keenness and penetration as my reverend friend can lay claim to, has acquitted us of idolatry, even if Christ be not there.

Dr. Johnson, as you all know, in Boswell's life of him, is recorded to have said, that "The Roman Catholic, even if Christ be not there, is not guilty of idolatry." Again, my learned opponent talks about a Catholic priest, who has come over to his Church, and a bright ornament of his Church he is, [laughter] "one of those dead weeds thrown over into your garden," as the facetious Swift expresses it. The rev. gentleman says this Nolan did not believe in the consecration of the Host, and, as a consequence, infers that he could not consecrate. I maintain that, as a priest, though bad, he still could consecrate. As I said before, the Catholic *believes* that Christ is present, and I would refer my friend to the learned Dr. Lingard, who has the following observation, which may serve to illustrate my meaning. "A man

goes and falls down at the feet of a fellow-warrior of a king, taking him for the king, and pays worship to him; I mean, what is called worship in Scripture, to a great man. Does he therefore offend his Majesty, as committing a disloyal act? His Majesty knows very well he is labouring under a mistake; and will Christ be offended by our thinking him present, and adoring him, when he is not present? The learned gentleman has observed very triumphantly, that "the Spirit quickeneth." Yes, I say, and that is a subject which occupies many laborious pages of the great St. Augustine, in order to prove that it is not the body and the blood alone that we take in the sacrament, unanimated by the immortal Spirit of Christ, but that it is the Spirit of Christ which renders the Sacrament which we take so efficacious; it is that glorified, that celestialized, that spiritualized body, as received in the Sacrament, which renders it so efficacious, so overflowing in its effects, upon the soul of its receivers.

An observation made by the learned gentleman, with regard to Bellarmine, I must positively contradict, as never having come from his pen, and I defy him to prove it. It is, that that learned theologian ever doubted for a moment of Transubstantiation.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I did not say so! What were the words?

Mr. FRENCH.—You said that on the 54th verse of the sixth chapter of St. John, he held the Protestant interpretation of that text, according to the opinions of certain divines, &c. You mentioned Jansenius too.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Read the words, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—While he is looking out the words, I will make a few observations. Gentlemen, I am

extremely sorry to be under the necessity, as I have been this evening, of following out my friend's arguments, so as to have been unable to expatiate on that divine sixth chapter of John, in reference to the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. I should have pointed out to you most clearly, as I read verse by verse, that either our blessed Saviour was an idle, ay, an incomprehensible squanderer of words, in misusing and torturing human language, or that he meant verily to impress on his disciples, that he was about to leave us that divine legacy of his love, his flesh to eat and his blood to drink. Were not the disciples of the divine Saviour, who must have known his language much better than Dr. Adam Clarke did, whose arguments my learned opponent copies—were not they (the disciples) suppressed [impressed] with the idea, that he did mean what he said? Of many it is said, "they walked no more with him;" that is, that they lapsed into Protestantism, they lived and died Protestants: protesting against the possibility of our Saviour's turning the bread into his body

and the wine into his blood. "They walked no more with him!" Christ was no longer their divine Master. They could not brook the idea of a man, even a man-god, telling them that he would give them his flesh to eat and his blood to drink. "They, therefore, walked no more with him." He then turned to Peter, and said, "Wilt thou also go away?" and Peter replied, "Lord, to whom should we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." It was that same Peter who was the first bishop of the Catholic Church. It is that Catholic Church which has handed down to you the Bible, from age to age, together with the immortal doctrine of Transubstantiation. Gentlemen, I believe I must close abruptly—not for want of matter, but for want of time.—[Here terminated the first evening's discussion.]

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

REV. J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH, ESQ.

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,
Reporter.

SECOND EVENING, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1839.

SUBJECT :

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

(Continued.)

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Throughout the past part of this important discussion in which we are engaged, I have experienced, I confess, the utmost courtesy from Mr. French, and I think you will all acquiesce in my opinion, when I say, that we have been most fairly treated by the Chairmen. The audience, also, has conducted itself in the most exem-

plary manner; and I know that my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen are too intensely interested in the decision of this question to give to it any other treatment than that of a profound, anxious, and prayerful attention. During the course of my quotations last evening, I had occasion to extract a passage from Belarmine, the distinguished cardinal

and advocate of the Church of Rome, respecting the sacrament of the Eucharist; and, in making that quotation, I gave you the reference, "book iii. ch. 23," which belonged to another quotation, instead of "book i. ch. 5, *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ*." If the slight mis-statement, in giving "book iii." instead of "book i." has either misled Mr. French, or occasioned him any unnecessary trouble, I hope he will attribute it to a mere *lapsus lingue*.

Having made these remarks as to the misquotation of figures, you will observe that the passage is *verbatim et literatim* as I quoted it. I have it here in the original Latin; and as my opponent has Bellarmine in his hands, he can accompany me, while I give the translation from the Latin:—"Moreover," he says, "almost all Catholics will have the words of John vi. understood of the sacrament of the Eucharist or of the sacramental eating of Christ's body in the Eucharist. *But there are some few who, the better to disprove the Hussites and Lutherans*, hold that this chapter meddleth not with any sacramental eating of Christ's body and drinking of his blood, of which sort are Gabriel, Nicolas Cusanus, Thomas Cajetanus, Ruardus Tapper, Joannes Hesselius and Cornelius Jansenius. All these Catholics, with great consent, teach that this chapter intreateth of the sacramental eating of Christ, which doubtless is most true."—Book i. ch. v.

On the former evening I think I irrefragably demonstrated, that John vi. is not an account of the Eucharist; and my opponent, indeed, has practically admitted that it was an irrefragable demonstration; for he has found it to be the most prudent course to retreat from the arguments which I adduced, and to leave them untouched in all their power and in all their conclusiveness. I proved

on that occasion, that this chapter (6th of John) could *not* refer to the Eucharist directly, and I had occasion to reiterate and to press the arguments used on that point, until I should extort from my friend, either a direct declaration that the chapter does *not* refer to the Lord's Supper at all, unless in a spiritual sense, or, on the other hand, a pledge to bring forward such arguments as should satisfy a dispassionate audience that it *does* refer to the sacrament of the Eucharist. Only, mark you, no person is called to prove a negative!—recollect, this is a principle in logic. I am not called on to prove that *it does not*—my learned opponent *is called on* to prove that *it does*. Now, observe, Bellarmine has admitted, in the extract which I have given, that there are in the Church of Rome, whose tongue is ever so eloquent of *unity*, doctors and dignitaries who allege that the 6th chapter of John does *not* refer to the Eucharist.

Illustrious and distinguished doctors, in his own Church, declare that it does not describe the Eucharist. The question, therefore, is resolved into this:—If Mr. French *be right*, the distinguished doctors of his own Church must be wrong. It is true Cardinal Bellarmine says, that these illustrious Roman Catholic divines held this opinion on the 6th of John *the better to refute the Hussites, the Lutherans, and heretics*; but I never can be so uncharitable as to believe, that these illustrious names have studiously concealed their real mind, and denied that this chapter refers to the Eucharist; or, in other words, told a falsehood for the unworthy end of refuting the heretics. Why, if it be truth, let it stand on its own eternal, immovable basis,—never let it be sacrificed to any ulterior ends. If *untruth*, then let us at

once reject it, as not worthy of our reception. I do not think that these learned Roman Catholic doctors would be guilty of such dishonourable, such disingenuous conduct, as to assert what they did not believe, for the sole purpose of overthrowing the Lutherans and the Hussites. I cannot believe it,—I cannot, I repeat, be so uncharitable as to believe that they assumed an interpretation they did not believe, for the sole and specific purpose of overthrowing the sentiments of an opponent. I will not allow this opinion of Bellarmine to enter into my mind. I give them the fullest and most implicit credit for integrity and candour, and take their declaration to be sincere, and that they did believe the chapter *not* to pertain to the sacramental eating of the body and drinking of the blood of Christ.

You will remember my opponent, among some quotations, to which he specially called my attention, read a very beautiful translation of a piece of doggerel Latin by the celebrated Thomas Aquinas, and said he read this beautiful poem to me to teach me a little better theology, and to give me a somewhat more correct notion of the real sentiments and principles of the Church of Rome than I seem hitherto to have entertained or imagined. My opponent has given us a considerable portion of Thomas Aquinas' *poetry*; suppose I give you a small portion of his *prose*. You observe, he called my attention to the *poetry* of Thomas Aquinas, to teach me *better* theology, and in order to give me a *clearer* and a more comprehensive view of the real sentiments of the Roman Catholic Church. Having heard the *poetry*, I will give you an extract from the *prose* of Aquinas; it is contained here in the second part of the Theological Sum-

mary of St. Thomas Aquinas, printed at Rome, 1586. Question xi. Article 3, p. 93.—*Are heretics to be tolerated?* "Although heretics are not to be tolerated, by reason of their delinquency, they are to be waited for till the second reproof, in order that they may return to the sound faith of the Church; but those who continue obstinate in their error, after the second reproof, are not only to be consigned to the sentence of excommunication, but also to the secular princes, to be exterminated. Hence, if the falsifiers of money, or other malefactors, are justly consigned to immediate death, by secular princes, much more do heretics, immediately after they are convicted of heresy, deserve, not only to be excommunicated, but also justly to be killed."

You have had the *poetry* of this seraphic and scholastic doctor, and you have now his *prose*. I ask, am I to embrace this theology? are these the sentiments of your Church? (to Mr. F.) Thomas Aquinas says these are the sentiments of the Church of Rome; that "heretics are to be consigned to the secular power to be exterminated;" and you desire me to go to that doctor for her theology. I should never have thought of calling your attention to this subject, simply because it is irrelevant to the question under disputation; but observe, I was directed by my opponent to the theology of Aquinas, as embodied in his poetry; and thinking it might be more deliberate and exact in his prose, I referred to it, and I now produce it. But let us have done with these poetical appeals. We are not to appeal to Helicon, from which poets drank, but to those fountains and to those "living streams," the oracles of God, to which Christians go. Our appeal, I say, is not to be to Parnassus,

with its fables and lying legends, but to "Mount Zion, the city of the living God," and to those sacred and immortal rescripts which God has sealed and sanctified with the signatures and tokens of inspiration.

You may recollect my opponent quoted a passage from Augustine, couched in hyperbolic language, and which seemed to go to establish the tenet of Transubstantiation; but I relieved and assisted my opponent's memory, by reading the remainder of the passage, which he forgot, and which went directly to establish the opposite conclusion. He quoted the *first part* of the passage, which seemed strongly to uphold Transubstantiation. I quoted the *second part*, or remainder, which most distinctly and clearly repudiated this dogma. Now, *conceding*, for a moment, to Mr. French, that both these contradictory sentiments had been actually entertained by St. Augustine, supposing that in one passage he held the doctrine of Transubstantiation as true—though he does not use the word—and suppose that in the next sentence he states the very reverse as true, I must then grant that St. Augustine, inconsistently enough, asserts both, and what must be the inference? It proves the necessity of appealing "from Cæsar unto Christ," from the writings of the fathers to the writings of the grandfathers, to the apostles and evangelists!

Mr. French, I know, is a candid and honourable man, and would not intentionally mutilate any part of Augustine; but observe, with the fallibility of individuals in general, he quoted a passage that just went to prove his purpose, and then left out—it might be by the merest accident—the remainder of the extract, which went to prove exactly the reverse; and you, my Roman Catholic friends, when you went

home, could not go to the writings of St. Augustine, and ascertain that this father asserts the very opposite to that which my opponent alleges; you can find no time to go to the British Museum, to ransack folios, pore over the learned and the elaborate writings of the fathers, and call my antagonist to account, when, either through accident, misfortune, or ignorance, he misquoted. It is impossible you should be able to do this; but when I go to God's Word, and quote a text from it, you can follow me, you can read the next, and the next, and the next, and so on, to the close; and, therefore, when we appeal to the Bible, we appeal to one *well known and common standard*, wherein I and Mr. French can be called to read on, if we try to content ourselves with reading only one particular clause, which suits our own specific views. My opponent, you recollect, brought forward a series of texts, by which he tried to show that the senses are frequently deceived. Now, I feel it right to state an important fact,—that whenever a Roman Catholic refers to a text in favour of any one of his particular tenets, I always find that the most overwhelming refutation of his views is given in the very text that he quotes.

The first reference for proving that the senses are deceived which Mr. French made, was to that of the disciples' journeying to Emmaus, to be found in Luke xxiv. 16, where it is stated that our Lord appeared unto them, and they "did not know him." Now mark, it states *the reason* of their not knowing him—"their eyes were holden." They were under a temporary and avowed restraint. Therefore, the question is, are our "eyes holden" miraculously also, so that when the flour and water is presented to our scrutiny, though we see these elements, yet the real pre-

sence is flesh? Is Mr. French prepared to show that the thousand, or two thousand eyes in this room are all "holden," so that they cannot "distinguish the things that differ," or know whether the substance on a Roman Catholic altar be flesh, or whether it be paste? But mark what follows: the eyes of the disciples subsequently corrected the momentary misapprehension, for it is stated immediately afterwards, that "as they thus spake" (in the 31st verse) "their eyes were opened, and they *knew* him,"—observe, the moment their "eyes were *opened*," that moment they recognised their Lord, and "knew" that it was Christ.

The next passage that my learned opponent quoted was from the 20th chapter of John, ver. 14, to which I shall accordingly refer; that "when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the *gardener*, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Now, observe, did she fancy that it was a *tree* and not a *man* that she saw, or that the *gardener* was a *mountain*? No, she saw a *man*, an individual, there; and, in her anxiety and excitement, in one of the most intense and thrilling moments in the annals of the human race, she could not believe that it was very Jesus that stood before her, but thought (a very frequent occurrence) that it was some one else. Now, supposing her eyes deceived her, how did she come to correct them? v. 16, "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, *Rabboni*, which is to say Master."

Observe, her *ear* corrected the

deception of her *eye*, if deception it might be called, for the moment that Christ's voice was heard, that moment the sense of hearing corrected the momentary misconception of sight, and she immediately recognised her Lord.

The next quotation which my opponent referred to was Christ Jesus appearing among the disciples "when the doors were shut." Now I replied to that before, and I challenged Mr. French to show that he passed through the doors or the walls. There is no statement to that effect. Suppose an individual had come to "the British School-room, Hammersmith," while we were listening to the various statements of the speakers on the platform, and had appeared in the midst of us, would any one dream, for a moment, that he came through the roof, or the walls, or the doors, without an opening? No, the common sense inference would be, he opened the door and came in; and to cast some light on our Lord's doings, in a not unparallel case, I find that when His blessed body lay in the grave, there was a great stone placed over and on the tomb: if his body had been in the habit of passing through solid and material obstructions, here was an instance and an opportunity, in which it might have passed through the solid stone, without the necessity of removing it. But so truly "was he in all points like unto us," that an angel came down from heaven to *roll away the massive rock* from the entrance, that the Lord of glory might ascend "to his Father and to our Father, to his God and to our God."

The next illustration brought forward by my learned antagonist, was the instance of a stick in the water. He said that if you put a stick into the water, from the eye, and a part of the stick being amid atmospheric

air, and the rest of the stick being in water, a denser medium, by the laws of refraction and reflection, the stick appears crooked. But how do we ascertain, after all, that the stick is straight? By the senses. If I put my hand down into the water, I *feel* that the stick is straight, or if I take the stick out of the water, and look at it, I *see* that it is straight, and find the reason of its apparent crookedness in optics. But where is the parallel? The bread lies upon the altar *before* consecration, and the senses say that it is bread, as the stick is in the hand before it is in the water, and the eyes see it to be straight. The bread lies upon the altar *after* consecration, and the senses see it to be bread, as the stick is taken out of the water and the eyes see it to be straight. *Before* the stick is *in* the water, and *after* it is *out* of the water, the senses tell you that it is straight; and *before* the bread is consecrated, and *after* it is consecrated, the senses also, ever honest, pronounce it to be *bread*. The illustration tells against the dogma it was adduced to prop up. I must now refer to a passage from Bellarmine, respecting the sacrament of the Eucharist, book iii. ch. 23. "For Scotus, whom Cameracensis follows, says three things: he says *there is no passage in Scripture so express as to compel the admission of Transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church.* AND THIS IS NOT WHOLLY IMPROBABLE; for though the Scripture, above all, seems to us sufficiently clear to convince any man who is not self-willed, yet whether this be so may well be doubted, seeing that the most learned and keen-sighted men, such as was Scotus, think differently."

Now, observe you, this distinguished advocate of the Church of Rome plainly and explicitly asserts,

that there is some probability that there is no passage in the Bible so express as to compel the necessity of a belief in Transubstantiation. Mark, then, the conclusion, my Roman Catholic friends! Here we find distinguished doctors, profound scholars, the first of the *literati* of the age, declaring it most deliberately, and recording their sentiments in their works, that the Scriptures do *not* compel our belief in Transubstantiation.

In the third place (Cardinal Bellarmine adds), because the Catholic Church declared what is Scripture in a General Council, so from Scripture, thus proclaimed, it asserted that Transubstantiation is proved. For it cannot but be the true sense of Scripture which he hands down who constructed the Scripture. For it is the same He, by His Spirit, who revealed the Scripture to the apostles and prophets, and who has explained it by the Church. One thing Scotus adds, which cannot be proved,—that, "before the Council of Lateran, Transubstantiation was not a dogma of the faith." Bellarmine here admits that Scotus held Transubstantiation not to have been a dogma of the faith before the fiat of the sanguinary Council of the Lateran persecution; and Transubstantiation appearing under the same patronage.

This General Council—the fourth council of the Lateran—not only broached this dogma of Transubstantiation, but also the idea, that the secular power should exterminate from their lands all heretics who shall be denounced by the Church. We have thus arrived at the most impressive admission from the mouth of high Roman Catholic authority, that the Scriptures do not so plainly assert the doctrine of Transubstantiation as to compel our

belief in it: and this is not the sentiment of one obscure doctor alone, but of some of the most distinguished and most acute doctors of the Roman Catholic Church. Having discovered this most ominous concession — having found Bellarmine recognising the fourth council of the Lateran as the voice of the Church on this question; a reference and recognition very ominous, for if Roman Catholics receive the decrees of the fourth council of the Lateran, I shall entertain a far worse conception of my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen than, at this moment, I am disposed to entertain;—Having found these things, I shall now lay down FIVE PROPOSITIONS on the doctrine of Transubstantiation:—

I. We contend, and it will be admitted by all thinking men, that the miracle of Transubstantiation is so anomalous, and so opposed to experience, and so different from all other miracles, THAT NOTHING BUT THE MOST POSITIVE AND INEVITABLE DECLARATION OF GOD'S WORD CAN NECESSITATE ITS BELIEF. Nothing short of this—neither the opinions nor traditions of fallible men, nor even the voice of a General Council, nor even the Church—will suffice.

II. If God's Word, by its inevitable sense and interpretation, necessitates the belief of Transubstantiation, all admit that we are bound to believe the positive and express declarations of God's Word, in contradiction even to the evidence of our senses.

III. But so repugnant is Transubstantiation to the evidence of the senses and to the nature of miracles, that even if the obvious sense of the passages declaring it could only be avoided by a mode of interpretation occasionally made use of by members of all churches, in very

extraordinary and rare instances, we should feel that no passage of holy writ demanded a recourse to these extraordinary and unusual modes of interpretation, more than the passages on which Transubstantiation is founded, and we should still feel ourselves entitled to contend that the Word of God, in that case, did not imperatively require our assent to the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

IV. *A fortiori*, if it can be shown that the ordinary and not the extraordinary mode of interpreting similar passages, even by the Church of Rome, is figurative, and that to assign a *literal* interpretation to the passage of the Gospel, adduced in support of Transubstantiation, requires an *extraordinary* mode of interpretation, even on the part of the Church of Rome, then we hold it to be undeniable, that there is nothing in the Word of God commanding our belief in Transubstantiation, and that it can only rest on the opinions and traditions of fallible men, and the voice of the Roman Catholic Church.

V. If these positions are established, every rational person will infer, we conceive, that the Church which violates its *usual* mode of interpretation, and adopts an *unusual* one, in order to infer a doctrine monstrous, and attended with monstrous consequences, whether she does so from blindness, or for the sake of exalting the priesthood, cannot be justly deemed the Church of Christ, and at this point alone it will be said, *causa finita est*.

In the *thirty-seven* texts which I shall quote from Old and New Testament Scripture, it will be seen, that, in order to avoid the most absurd and ridiculous ravings and extravagance, the Church of Rome *does* and must adopt the *figurative* mode of interpretation, and, in one

or two solitary texts relating to the Lord's Supper, she forgets her uniform treatment of all kindred and homogeneous texts, and starts an extraordinary, and, in reference to these symbolic formulas of thought, novel and literal mode of interpretation. If in all the thirty-seven my opponent insist on the *literal*, I promise to give it him, and leave him to manage the products of his own premises. If he do not insist on the literal, he must, in consistency, give up Transubstantiation and its patroness the Roman Church.

I quote, from the Roman Catholic version, from Gen. xli. 26. "The seven good kine which thou seest *are* seven full years of plenty." Observe, my opponent says, "*This is my body*," means, this is changed, or transubstantiated into my body; and that the *host* is, after consecration, *bonâ fide* the body and blood, soul and divinity, *ossa et nervos*, of the Son of God,—that the moment the priest has said, "*This is my body, this is my blood*," that then the host is no longer merely a piece of flour and water, but "the soul and divinity, body and blood, *ossa et nervos*, of the Son of God." I now ask, whether or not this is the ordinary or *extraordinary* mode of interpretation that is adopted by the Church of Rome, and if I am to attach the mode of interpretation applied to the institution of the Eucharist in the following passages? Will my learned opponent, on this principle, hold that "the seven full ears of corn" are actually and *bonâ fide* transubstantiated and changed into "seven years of plenty?" I presume my opponent will not admit of such monstrous construction. He will surely say the seven full ears are symbolic or representative of seven years of plenty; and, if so, why insist on another mode of inter-

pretation in another purely parallel text?—Gen. xlix. 9: "*Judah is a lion's whelp*." Now, as my opponent contends "*this is my body*" means "*this is changed into my body*," "*the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God*," then, of course, he is fully prepared to follow out this principle of interpretation, and to believe that Judah, a tribe, or the head of a tribe, ceased to be a man, or to have a human body at all, and actually became a "*lion's whelp*," having all the essential features, bones, mane, beard, and other characteristics of a lion. I can see no other alternative. He says, "*this is my body*" means this is turned into "*the body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Son of God*;" then, I say, "*Judah is a lion's whelp*" means, is changed into a lion's whelp. If not, some reason for the application of a new method of interpretation in this passage must be adduced. And, therefore, I demand it most courteously and kindly, but firmly, when he rises to reply, at least some explanation why I am to be debarred from the literal mode of interpretation in the one, and tied down within the other passage? why one mode of interpretation is here, and another there?

Gen. xlix. 14: "*Issachar is a strong ass*"—"Issachar," the tribe, "*is a strong ass*." Now, on this principle of interpretation, does my opponent mean to assert that Issachar became a literal donkey, with long ears and four feet! (laughter.) My friends, it is no laughing matter, I assure you. I know that the soul of Mr. French is in jeopardy in believing these monstrous positions, and, therefore, (for I speak plainly and truly as becomes me, and as one who sympathizes with the position of our Roman Catholic friends,) I implore you rather to pray that the Spirit of the living God would lead

him to abandon these unhappy and untenable positions, and come to the religion of the Bible, that hallowed and hoary faith which the Spirit of the living God taught and inspired.

Rom. iii. 13: "Their throat *is* an open sepulchre." Now, my opponent says, "this is my body" means, *it* is turned into "the body and blood, soul and divinity, bones and nerves of the Son of God," as I showed you from the documents of the Church of Rome; then, of course, he insists, most consistently, on this, to me, extraordinary interpretation, and says, that their throat was actually turned into a pit six feet long, in the church-yard, and become the actual and circumstantial abode of the mouldering dead; or else he must abandon the literal principle, and come to the conclusion of common sense, and admit that "an open sepulchre" is the sign, or the symbol of their spirit and language, or that their throat is well and aptly represented by "an open sepulchre."—Again, I quote from Psalm exix. 5: "Thy word *is* a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path." Now my opponent, on his principle, must maintain that God's word is transubstantiated into "a lamp." I find that the Bible says most expressly, "Thy word *is* a light, *is* a lamp;" and this is precisely parallel with "This *is* my body, this *is* my blood." I protest I can see no alternative, but either to believe that all these passages are to be literally interpreted in the way I am doing, or that we must depart from this literal interpretation, and hold that "this is my body" means that it is the sacred symbol, or sign, or seal, or representative of my body.

Again, I quote from another passage in Isaiah, which I referred to before; and you observe, instead of my oppo-

nent having given a fair and candid reply to the argument, he wholly passed it by. Now let us meet these declarations of the word of God, and I am prepared, as far as I know my own heart, to acquiesce entirely in the result, when it shall be clearly proved from God's holy Word, and brought home, with power, to my understanding and my conscience. The quotation from Isaiah is, "all flesh *is* grass." (Isaiah xl. 6.) Observe, in the announcement, "this *is* my body," there is nothing more added, in the way of affirmation, but here it is, "all flesh *is* grass," "*indeed*, the people *is* grass." "Surely," according to our version, "the people *is* grass."

Now, suppose I proceed on the supposition that my learned opponent is right in the assertion, that "this is my body" means this is made my flesh and blood, I must then proceed to apply this "most ancient interpretation" of the text to this passage now before us, "all flesh *is* grass." I assert, therefore, that Mr. French is neither a fish of the sea, nor a fowl of the air, nor a beast of the field, nor a member of earthly society,—I assert that he is a *bundle of grass* [laughter, and cries of "Order!"] I am driven to it—he has brought me into this position by insisting on a literal interpretation. I assert that that voice, which is so eloquent, and so earnest, in pleading for what he conceives to be truth, is not a man's voice, but the whistling of the wind through the leaves of grass; I maintain that those hands, so courageously uplifted to defend his own views, are merely the spiral leaflets of green grass. I maintain that he has no animal life; that if you smite him, he will not cry; that if you call to him he will not answer; that, unlike Shakespeare's Jew, if you tickle him he will not laugh; that he is nothing

but a bundle of "accidents and species," instead of being versed in scholastic subtleties,—that, in fact, he is not, vitally and *bonâ fide*, the earnest pleader for the Roman Catholic faith, but a pure vegetable production. I am actually forced into this: I would I could extricate myself. If Mr. French would give up Transubstantiation, I could do so; but at present I am placed in a position out of which I cannot go, according to his literal mode of interpretation. Again, I quote—(I am quoting from the Douay Bible)—from Jer. li. 7:—"Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, a golden cup that made all the earth drunken." My friend is versed in history; he has read the fathers: will he be so kind as to bring forward the precise passage which shews, that that mighty city, Babylon, has been once in its history "a golden cup;" that instead of being the walls and houses of a great city, it was actually a golden cup?

Again, I quote from Prov. xviii. 10: "The name of the Lord is a strong tower." Now, pursuing the same literal method, for Roman Catholics have no choice in the matter, I must assert, that God's "name" is actually and *bonâ fide* transubstantiated into a strong tower, and, instead of adopting our Protestant interpretation, that "the name of the Lord is symbolised or represented by the shelter afforded by a strong tower," must follow out the Roman Catholic principle of interpretation, and insist that "the name of the Lord is," actually, "a strong tower."—Again, I quote Dan. vii. 17: "These great beasts are four kingdoms." We are, therefore, to understand by this, that the four beasts who are described by the prophet, became actually, on the pronounciation of these words, *four kingdoms*, with provinces and towns, with domes,

and spires, and minarets, and porticoes, and halls, and thrones and kings, and that the animals ceased to belong to zoological tribes, and became vast political confederacies.

Again, "The ram which thou seest, is the king of the Medes and the Persians." I must be disrespectful enough to believe, that the "king of the Medes and Persians," who I imagined to have sprung from an ancient and a lofty lineage, was originally "a ram," and that, when these words were pronounced, that then this ram, by a magic leap, jumped into the royal skin and the imperial purple, assumed the crown, became the king, and sat upon the throne of a mighty empire. Yet, observe, if this were the sportive fancies of an idle mind they would deserve to be treated with contempt; but these interpretations are the legitimate results of a principle and mode of interpretation which the Church of Rome insists on and adheres to. She must receive these interpretations, or abandon the dogma of Transubstantiation. One or other, if she would be consistent, she must do. If she insists on the literal in "This is my body," then I insist fully on the literal in these texts, and if I may not, I demand that my opponent show cause.—Dan. ii. 38: "Thou art the head of gold." "Thou," Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, "thou art a head of gold?" Now, what a monstrous compliment to Nebuchadnezzar, if he understood it as Roman Catholics must, to be consistent, that when these words were uttered, his head, instead of remaining, like the heads of other people, a cranium more or less filled with brains—that useful commodity in the discussion of truth—became, actually became, solid, massive gold! I fear this would not be a safe Transubstantia-

tion, as too many would be exceedingly anxious to cut off and appropriate the monarch's head!

Again, I quote from Matt. xi. 14, where it is said of John the Baptist, that "He is Elias that is to come." Now am I to believe that John was actually changed into Elias, that he actually became Elias? My opponent must hold this extravagant belief, or renounce the literal interpretation of the parallel and homogeneous text on which Transubstantiation hangs; and I wait with profound anxiety for those statements which my learned adversary may bring forward to show why this interpretation may not be followed out, which he and his Church insist on in the explanation of the words, "This is my body."—Again, I quote from Matt. xiii. 38: "The field is the world," that is, my opponent must consistently believe, that this field was actually transubstantiated into the *whole world!* that this field, consisting of so many acres, roods, and perches, by the incantation and the magic of the words, "this is the world,"—became actually the solid globe, "the whole world." Many farmers would give thousands for these alchymical, these magic powers, which turn one field into a thousand—one acre into the whole world.

John x. 7: "Amen, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." Now, you remember with what indignation Mr. French repelled, last evening, the necessary consequence of his own principles—that our Lord became a door. I thank him for that indignation: it was nobly exhibited; it was every way worthy an honest and ingenuous mind, that listened with indignation to the degrading hypothesis. But will not my opponent sympathize with me when I express a holy indignation, that a piece of flour

and water should be declared to be "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God?" Surely, if his indignation has manifested itself with such ardour, and been accompanied with so powerful a disclaimer at the gross and debasing imputation, have not I some cause for the same display of indignation, and some apology for an overflowing zeal, when I reclaim against the monstrous sentiment, that a piece of bread and water should be held up and adored as "the body and blood, soul and divinity, *ossa et nervos*, of the Son of God?" But of course my learned adversary must be prepared with strong reasoning to repudiate the inference which I feel to be inevitable, and I crave for him your most patient and courteous attention.

Again, in Romans, iii. 13, "The venom of asps is under their lips." My opponent contends for this literal interpretation; he abhors my "orientalisms;" he does not relish that word; he knows too well how expressive it is of the sins of the fathers. I repel it, too, for once, and take my stand with him, and say, "the poison of asps is under the lips" of the wicked;—perhaps a physician could tell you how long it would be there without producing any disastrous results, and the wicked will be able to explain the taste and flavour and sensation produced by a deadly poison under their lips. I must thus interpret these kindred passages, or my adversary must give me clear and conclusive reasons why I should not do so.

Again, 1 Cor. x. 4: "That rock was Christ." Now observe, Mr. French insists on a literal interpretation. He cannot away with figures. I therefore most honestly follow it out, and accordingly I come to the conclusion, that "that rock" was actually transubstantiated into "Christ," or

that "Christ" was transubstantiated into "that rock;" and therefore we shall have our blessed Lord, not merely under the *species* of "bread and wine," but under the *species* also of a "rock," a literal "rock." We, my Protestant friends, have been accustomed to believe that the sacred sentiment, "that rock was Christ," means that Christ alone is the foundation, and that stability, endurance, safety, and shelter, are the blessings realised under that great rock in a weary land: and that as *Peter*, or the character of *Peter*, is "a rolling stone," our "rock," the epithet of Jesus Christ, is "a stone," against which hell's gates and hell's artillery *never, never* shall prevail. Antipathy to our Church will not allow my opponent to adopt this interpretation, and consistency will not allow him to reject the other. He is either a Protestant, or an extravagant believer in most absurd things.

Again, Gal. ii. 20:—"With Christ I am nailed to the cross." In our translation it is, "I am crucified with Christ." Now this literal interpretation must be followed by the Church of Rome, if she desires to be consistent, and the necessary result of it is that the apostle Paul was actually and *bonâ fide* "nailed to the cross" along with our Lord Jesus Christ himself.—Gal. iv. 24: "These are two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai engendering bondage, which is *Agar*." That is, this "covenant" or testament, if we adopt Mr. French's patent process of interpretation, is transubstantiated into a woman, whose name was "*Agar*."—Eph. i. 22: "He *is* head over all things to his Church, which is his *body*." Observe, it is not only "the bread and wine" that became "the body and blood" of Christ, but the Church becomes his body also. If my op-

ponent assert, that when it is said, "this *is* my body," the bread becomes Christ's body and blood, then also, when it is said of Christ, the Church is Christ's body, it necessarily follows that the Church is transubstantiated into his body.

These few quotations which I have already adduced may suffice, and therefore I shall not pursue them any further. I may merely mention that I have here THIRTY-SEVEN different texts, all of this kind, which I might lay before you, to all of which, let it be observed, the Church of Rome applies and must apply the figurative and ordinary mode of interpretation, while, to the words, "this is my body," without reason, without analogy, without precedent, the Church of Rome attaches an extraordinary interpretation, fraught with folly and monstrosities. He must abandon Transubstantiation, or be saddled with the consequences I have inferred. I was much surprised, by the bye, at a quotation adduced by my opponent on the previous evening, viz. "God *is* love," or, as his translation has it, "God *is* charity." I really thought he had actually become a Protestant, and that he had begun to contend for those truths to which he had been a stranger so long: for if there be one text which more beautifully proves the absurdity of Transubstantiation, and the truth of those sentiments which I am now advocating, it is that very text, for which I most kindly thank my learned opponent. He said, we Protestants make God the Lucretian deity, that is, a god of that one attribute—that we make God the god of Lucretius. If the words are to be taken in their literal meaning and acceptance, that "God *is* love," we must understand that the Deity is transubstantiated into love. Therefore, instead of my having the credit

of this novel and extraordinary construction, I give it back to Mr. French, and beg to assure him that the method of interpretation adopted by his Church is chargeable, and justly, with the guilt of representing our God as the Lucretian deity.

After having made these statements, I insist on a fair and close reply, for I am here, not to adduce arguments and see, as heretofore, my opponent run from them as far as the east is distant from the west, but to state great truths, which must either be disproved or adopted. I have opened the discussion, and I do now most candidly and courteously insist that my opponent rise and meet me, step by step, and verse by verse, and demonstrate to me that I am wrong in these matters, to our common and complete satisfaction, or that he abjure his creed and embrace that of the Bible.

I have several objections made by my opponent, which I should like to go over, but I find I have but five minutes more. An objection was made to my quotation, "*De Defectibus Missæ*," that it gave a handle to Deists. This (Bible) is my standard of appeal: This book of God is the store-house of my arguments,—is that *Deism*? Here is my fount of light, and of knowledge, and of goodness,—am I a Deist? I go to this blessed book—I take all my sentiments from its pages, and if this be Deism, oh! then, "where thou goest I will go, where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God!" My opponent stated that my quotation from the "*De Defectibus Missæ*," in which it is stated that the host, after being changed into Christ's body, and blood, and divinity, may be carried away by a mouse, or a cat, or any other animal, gave a handle to Deists. I am grieved, indeed, that

I was compelled to use such expressions, but who has the discredit of the phraseology? I never invented it—it never entered into my mind, I solemnly assure you, till I read the passages in the "*De Defectibus Missæ*." I never dreamt that my Lord, "who dieth no more," who is "at the right hand of the Father," could be, in the imagination of his professing Church, dragged down by the incantations of a priest, and subjected to all the degradation and the ignominy, the ills, the sorrows, and the trials, through which he once passed in his earthly pilgrimage among men! I never believed the bare possibility of such a thing. It was reserved for the Church of Rome to imagine and record the possibility of such blasphemy. It is the Church that records such abominations, which gives a handle to Deists.

There is one point left I have time to notice before I sit down. Mr. French said, was not our Lord, when a child, liable to be torn by wild beasts? I grant it. But is there not a vast difference? Our Lord was then in the flesh, liable to be spit upon, to be buffeted, to want, to bleed, to die, to be mocked, to be buried; but what saith the Scripture? Rom. vi. 9: "*He dieth no more.*" Mark that!—"no more;" "*Death hath no more dominion over him;*" and though he was liable to every reproach, insult, and ignominy—yea, liable to death itself, when he was a babe and a man of sorrow on the earth, you know that "*he dieth no more;*" death hath no more dominion over him;" you know that he is far, far beyond the reach of every accident and every insult—that "*he ever liveth,*" at God's hand, "*to make intercession for us;*" and, therefore, the supposition that, because our Lord was nursed in a manger, and subject to sore and painful trials in

our stead, and for our sins, on this earth, the possibilities of the *De Defectibus* are neither untrue nor irreverent, is most illogical and eminently absurd. I therefore call on you, my dear Roman Catholic friends, not to entertain such sentiments, but to abjure and abandon them as dishonourable to God.

[Here the reverend gentleman's hour terminated.]

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen. Before I come to the subject under discussion, I shall beg leave to advert to one altogether extraneous to it, and sorry I am that it was introduced by my rev. friend. It was a passage which he quoted from St. Thomas of Aquin with respect to heretics. I take it for granted that the words in St. Thomas of Aquin are clearly and accurately recorded. Aquinas does give his opinion, as a theologian, "that heretics, after certain admonitions, may be handed over to the secular power." That, I say, is an opinion of his—it is not mine; it is not an article of the Catholic faith, and has nothing to do with the question. As a private individual, and as a Catholic, permitted by my Church to indulge opinions of this kind, I boldly state, that I am not only against persecution for religion, but also against the connexion of Church and State in any country of the universe. That is my opinion: but since I have turned my eyes to the politics of human life, I have never been able to see one sect in religion, in power, connected with the state, that did not persecute for religion; all alike, Roman Catholics, or Protestants, or others, in this country; all have persecuted for religion.

But as the learned gentleman told you, also, that he wished, *en passant*, to show you some words in prose of Aquinas, after a little bit of his

poetry with which I regaled you, I will show him, in return, one of the deeds of his celebrated Calvin, namely, his burning Servetus at the stake, because he did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. [Murmurs among the Catholics, and cries of "Order!"] Therefore, gentlemen, this kind of extrinsic argument is totally at an end. And now, before I proceed further, I should wish my Protestant friends to entertain a clearer notion as to the way by which Catholics mean that Christ is received in the sacrament of the Eucharist, for you have not heard one argument, though you have had a copious out-pouring of words; you have not heard one solid argument to refute the verity of that sacrament. The manner of Christ's presence is thus laid down by our sound theologians, and we Catholics all acquiesce in it; and what is thus taught is to be found in the book called "The Faith of Catholics:—" "Christ is not present in this sacrament according to his natural way."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—What is the book?

Mr. FRENCH.—It is "The Faith of Catholics," by Kirk and Berrington.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—That is enough.

Mr. FRENCH.—"Christ is not present in this sacrament according to his natural mode of existence, nor subject to corporeal contingencies." That is the manner of receiving him; it is quite a different thing to what my learned friend conceives. St. Austin will still further illustrate it. "What therefore means," says St. Austin, "that phrase, '*the flesh profiteth nothing*?' It profiteth nothing in the manner in which they understood it, for they understood it to mean flesh as it is mangled in a dead body, or as it is sold in the market; not as it is quickened by the animating spirit of life."—*St. Aug. Tract 27, vol. iii. p. 503.*

And now, if I were in the presence of an assembly that knew not how to discriminate, that is, that was likely to be more content with mere volubility of words and elegantly flowing language than with solidity of argument, I should not be, on the present occasion, animated with that strength and that confidence which I feel in the glorious cause which I have undertaken to defend. On the contrary, in that case, I should be dispirited and dejected in the extreme; for certainly I have to contend with a most practised and expert orator,—a gentleman capable, beyond doubt, with the utmost facility, of expressing himself on any subject that enters into his mind, and of making the argument his own, or at least making it appear so, by the vehemence and the impressiveness with which he speaks, and the seeming elegance with which he clothes his ideas. And yet, notwithstanding this advantage on his part, I candidly own that I am full of favourable anticipation as to the result of this discussion, when I cast my eyes upon the feebleness of my learned friend's arguments to subvert the grand dogma of Transubstantiation. I mean both those which were adduced at our last meeting and those which have been superadded to them this evening. If that is all I have to contend with, I have, I think, already said enough in my appeals to the Testament, that book of books, and in my appeals to the fathers of the Church.

As specimens of the learned gentleman's fragility of argument, on the former evening of this discussion, I shall beg leave to call his and your attention to the mode in which he endeavoured to invalidate that ever-memorable text of the Gospel, which appeared so strong to Martin Luther that he defied a whole ge-

neration of men to shake it; namely, "Take, eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood." The mode in which my friend endeavoured to weaken that grand text, you may remember, was by questioning the accuracy of my quotation from the New Testament, with which he is so familiar; and then, when he found himself foiled in his attempt, he directed my attention to another text, which he wished me to quote in preference:—Luke xxii. 19, 20. "This cup is the new testament in my blood." This would have given an opportunity to my learned friend to say, what indeed he has said, though I avoided the text in order to ward off such nonsense—that if Transubstantiation was to take effect the moment that certain words were pronounced, it would follow consecutively, that the cup was also to be transubstantiated. Now it appeared to me to be a most extraordinary argument, and not worthy the dignity of his character, acquainted as he is with the laws of reasoning, inasmuch as every one must know that if I say that I saw a man drink a glass of wine, I do not mean to make an impression that he swallowed the glass with the wine. And that the cup was not an essential part of this doctrine, is proved from the circumstance of Matthew's not mentioning the cup, but simply making Christ to say, "Take, eat, this *is* my body, and drink, this *is* my blood of the new testament." But, gentlemen, it is not my intention to permit the invincibility of this grand text to be so slightly passed over. I shall read you the words of Luther upon it,—his own words. *Luther. tom. vii. 502*:—"I cannot deny, neither do I wish to do so, that had Carlstadt, or any other person, been able, five years ago, to persuade me that wine and bread alone consti-

tuted the Sacrament, he would have conferred upon me an inestimable favour; for, to tell you the truth, it is a subject in the investigation of which I was then most anxiously and laboriously engaged. I strained every nerve to extricate and disentangle myself from the embarrassment, knowing, as I did full well, that it was a point that above all others would enable me to give the greatest annoyance to the papacy; but I find myself completely bound in fetters, without any possibility of escaping; the text of the Gospel is too clear."

This text, therefore, I still maintain, remains whole and entire, totally unbroken by the oriental weapons of my learned friend. Such are the words of Luther, and he acted up to the spirit of them to the end of his life, maintaining the real corporeal presence, though differing from us in one respect. He believed in Consubstantiation, we believe in Transubstantiation. Luther, therefore, the father of Protestantism, maintains that that text is too clear to be distorted by any ingenuity, and of course to be proof against that orientalism in which my learned friend so much delights and glories.

My rev. friend maintains, that, instead of its being too clear in favour of the corporeal presence, that all Catholic generations that have gone by, with all the Catholic world at present, nay, with Luther himself, the father of Protestantism, are all wholly inadequate to pass any judgment whatever upon it. He virtually maintains so. Luther was persuaded that he saw an affirmative in this text, "take, eat, this is my body;" my learned friend is persuaded that he sees in it a negative: "this is *not* my body." Luther declares that all opponents of the doctrine of the corporeal presence,

to use his own words, "are heretics and aliens to the Church;" my rev. opponent affirms, that all the advocates of the corporeal presence are rank idolaters, and, consequently, with one wide, sweeping, one merciless *anathema*, excludes them all from the kingdom of heaven; a kingdom, thank God, of which my reverend friend is not the possessor of the keys. [Applause from the Catholic party, and cries of "Order!"] Luther tells us that he was completely held in fetters by this strong-binding, circumscriptive text; my learned and ingenious friend declares that it is mere superstition—mere enchantment in any one that is thus bound, and immediately dissolves the chains of such deluded mortals by the magic all-potent touch of his oriental wand.

Poor, unhappy Luther! unversed as he was in orientalism! He lived and died, alas, three hundred years ago, maintaining to the end the doctrine of the real corporeal presence of Christ in the sacred Eucharist, instead of its being reserved for the new-sprung lights of the nineteenth century. But oh! my friends, what a contrast, what a striking contrast do we not behold here, between the simplicity of "the father of the Reformation" and the remarkable ingenuity and acuteness of his descendants! What dulness, what inaptitude, what stupidity in reading this plain-speaking Gospel on the part of Luther; and what penetration, what keenness, what acuteness, and intelligence, on the part of all his sons! Really, my friends, notwithstanding the sublime soar that my learned friend took the other evening into the regions of natural philosophy, when he very gravely and methodically proved that a man could not be, with reference to himself, at once both grandfather and grandson, it appears to me, not-

withstanding, that such a character can exist; that is, a grandchild, in point of age, who is a grandfather at the same time in point of wisdom and maturity of intellect. Such is the preciousness of the present race of readers of the Bible, that, in the words of the poet,—“The text inspires not them, but they the text inspire.”

They all see, at one glance, that what Luther declared to be too literal to be distorted into metaphor and “orientalized,” they all see, in the present day, that it is too clearly figurative to be distorted into literality. But, I ask, what rule, what standard of faith must that be, where a man, sitting down to interpret the Bible for himself, in a text of such unspeakable importance, or, as my reverend friend has frequently said this evening, is of such “vital importance that the salvation of your soul hangs on it.”—I say, what rule of faith must that be where, whilst the Bible is supposed to speak plainly and intelligibly to all, the very father of the Reformation differs in his deduction from all? how is it that each individual is enabled, in the nineteenth century, to descry so intuitively, that these words, “Take, eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood,” are positively figurative. when such a man as Luther, though he strained every nerve to produce [reduce] it to figurativeness, in order to give annoyance to the Papacy, declared that the text stared him too strongly in the face, so that he could never get over it. And yet my learned friend ridicules my simplicity (though he did not actually use the word as Dr. Adam Clarke has done) in not being able to see a negative in this text where Luther saw an affirmative, and where I see an affirmative, and where all Catholics, to the end of the world, will see an affirmative. I ask, then, is

this permission to every man to interpret the Bible for himself, taking it as the sole rule of faith, ever likely to lead to “*unity in the bond of peace?*” Is it the proper rule to knit the minds of men in one harmonious consent, in one and the same doctrine or body of tenets, so as to supersede the necessity of the “one sheepfold and the one Shepherd,” the ever-existing, never-changing Catholic church, which still cries out, in all ages, and in all countries, in the language of the apostle of the Gentiles, “the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?”

I come now to make an observation or two with reference to communion in one kind, which was touched upon by my learned friend on the last evening, and which I had no time to answer. My reverend friend alleges that the cup, by which expression the blood is commonly meant, that is, “the thing containing for the thing contained,” is taken away from the laity; but when we Catholics say the cup, we mean the blood, and I maintain that the cup is not taken away from the laity any more than his sacred body is taken away; because it is an article of our faith that from the body the blood is inseparable, and he who takes a drop of the consecrated wine or bread takes the blessed, glorified, and spiritualized body of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. That is the doctrine which we profess, and which we sincerely believe in. But, my friends, it shall not be my bare assertion that communion in one kind is lawful. I shall prove it by four texts. The learned gentleman, when I have read one, will easily accredit me for the four, though I have only one at present.

The first text is Luke xxiv. 30 :—
 “And it came to pass, that as they sat at meat with him, that he took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave unto them.” This I contend to be communion in one kind. I have for it the authority of several fathers of the Church, among others, St. Augustine and the venerable Bede. But the principal text I wish to call your attention to is that of St. Paul, first Cor. epistle first, which I am compelled to read in Greek, because it is vitiated—purposely vitiated, and stripped of its meaning by the English Protestant translation. I should much rather advert to the Protestant translation, as being more familiar to the majority of my audience; but wherever it is deliberately, wantonly, and indefensibly vitiated, in order to delude the people of this country, there I am compelled to read the genuine Greek. It is at the 27th verse; and I beg you to remark, that it is only one Greek word that I am going to teach you, viz. the letter “*ε*,” which means “*or*” in Greek.

Now I shall explain and construe it, and I beg perfect silence whilst I give the interpretation :—
 “Whoever shall eat this bread,” (*ε*) “*or* shall drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.” Such is the proper translation. Now the Protestant translation is abominable, and wicked, and false; it is indefensibly false, because the translators knew it to be so when they put *and* for *or*. In order to show that communion in one kind was not available, they turned *ε* into *kai*, which means *and*, whilst *ε* means *or*. Is there not, my friends, a curse denounced against any one who shall either add or take from that sacred book?

There you have communion in one kind, and depend upon it the

learned gentleman, when he rises, will have to perspire a great deal, before he give a lucid and satisfactory answer to that identical text. “Where does the Scripture,” says Bishop Montague, “command the people to receive the sacrament of the Lord’s supper in both kinds? The Scripture teaches no such thing.” And why does a Protestant bishop acknowledge this? Because he had studied Scripture deeply; because he knew that the translation was false; yes, he knew that the text I have just now quoted was false in the English. Can I entertain a doubt, therefore, as to this being communion in one kind; no, most undoubtedly I cannot; but if I did, much rather would I light my little candle at the lamp of the great St. Augustine, still vividly burning in his immortal pages, and who asseverates it to be such communion, than I would ask the opinion of my reverend friend concerning that important text—such love, such reverence, such admiration have I for the orthodox doctors of sound antiquity, when compared with the conceited, the arrogant superficialists of the present day.

As to the question of my learned friend, how was it that the good thief was admitted into Paradise without partaking of the Lord’s body, which I so much insisted on?—I ask him, in my turn, since “no man without baptism can enter into the kingdom of heaven,”—how is it that the good thief, unbaptized, was received into those happy regions? As I have not now much time left, I shall beg leave before I sit down—for I am very loth to leave this text, which is commonly called Luther’s invincible text, and which is likewise the text by which Catholics of every age before his existence clearly proved their doctrine of Transubstantiation

—before I sit down, it will not be unseasonable to corroborate it, by one or two extracts from the fathers. Speaking of this very text, St. Chrysostom says, “This *is* my body.” This sentence effects a total transmutation in what lies before:—*τοῦτο το ρημα μεταρρυθμιζει τα προκειμενα.*—*St. Chrys. tom. ii. p. 384. Edit. Benedict.*

St. Gregory of Nyssa, A.D. 372, says: “But now these things he gives unto us, *trans-elementing by the force of the blessing* the nature of the visible species into that body:—*ταυτα δη διδωσιν ἡμιν τη της ευλογιας δυναμει προς εκεινο μεταστοιχειωσας των φαινομενων την φυσιν,*” *tom. iii. p. 105, fol. edit. Morell, Paris, 1638.*

My reverend friend, who is well acquainted with the Greek language, and not only my learned friend who is arguing with me, but both my learned friends in their respective chairs, who are thoroughly acquainted with the Greek language, will be able to tell you that, in the whole compass of that copious tongue, there is not a stronger or more expressive word than *metastokeiosas*, that is, “trans-elementing;” and shall I be told, after this, by my learned friend, or by any Protestant theologian whatever, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was invented in the ninth century, and that the first treatise was written by Pascasius Rhadbert? Why this single sentence is worth whole treatises on the doctrine of Transubstantiation, written with the utmost copiousness and prolixity. Is it possible for any man to find out a word equal to it in the English language? It would sink under the weight of it; there is no possibility; it is not rich enough; no modern language is rich enough to convey such a powerful idea, without the coinage of a word of an ana-

logous nature, from the Greek or Roman.

Now, gentlemen, let us investigate calmly which of the two, Catholic or Protestant, discerns the true meaning of this mystery with the greater spiritual acuteness and comprehension, as it is expounded in the 6th chapter of John. And here I must say, that whatever the mighty Bellarmine might have thought, who seems, by-the-by, a great favourite with my learned friend,—whatever, I say, Bellarmine might have thought with reference to the said chapter, it will not alter my opinion in any degree whatever. I can read as well as Bellarmine, I can understand as well as Bellarmine, and there is no article of my faith which forbids me to interpret, on this occasion, according to my own will and my own fancy. “Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven (John vi. 31). Then Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, Moses gave not bread from heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread which cometh down from heaven.”

Here I must observe, that it is impossible to read a single sentence in this divine chapter that has not been illustrated and enriched by some valuable observations by one or other of the fathers of the Church, which tends to show you what was the primitive belief on the subject in discussion. This allusion to manna is illustrated by the following remark from the great St. Ambrose: he is catechizing or instructing a pupil:—“You (he says to him) are acquainted with far better things; inasmuch as light is preferable to shade, truth to figure, the body of the founder to manna from heaven. Perhaps, you may say, I see a very different thing before me: how do you affirm to me that I see the body

of Christ? This it is that remains for me to prove. How many examples have we not at command to prove that what is here is not what nature has formed, but what the benediction has consecrated; and that the efficacy of the benediction preponderates over that of nature, since by the benediction nature itself is changed! Moses held the rod; he cast it down, and it became a serpent. Again, he seized the serpent by the tail, and it resumed the nature of the rod. See you not, therefore, that, by the prophetic grace, the nature of the serpent and the rod was twice changed?"

St. Ambrose then enumerates many other miraculous changes mentioned in the sacred writings, and thus proceeds:—"Now, if the blessing of man was so potent that it could change nature, what say we of the divine consecration, where the very word themselves of the Lord our Saviour operate? for that Sacrament which you receive is accomplished by the word of Christ. If the word of Elias had such power that it could bring down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ have power to change the form of the elements? You have read the account of all the works of the creation. *He said, and it was done; he commanded, and they were formed.* The word, therefore, of Christ which had power to make from nothing that which was not, is it not able to change those things which actually are into things which they were not? for it is not a less exertion of power to give new existence to things, than to change the nature of things existing. But why have recourse to illustrations? Let us bring forward examples appertaining to the subject, *and by the instance of the incarnation, let us substantiate the truth of the mystery.* Was it in conformity to the ordinary course

of nature, that our Lord Jesus was born of Mary? If it be nature that we are in quest of, no other means present themselves but the law of matrimony. It is evident, therefore, that, in deviation from the wonted course of nature, a virgin brought forth a son, *and it is that very body which we produce. Why here do you require the order of nature as to the body of Christ, since, in opposition to the wonted course of nature, the Lord Jesus himself was brought forth by a virgin?* Verily, the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried, of necessary consequence, constitute the sacrament of that flesh. *Our Lord Jesus himself pronounces it, This is my body.* Before the benediction of the celestial words, it is called bread (species); after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before the consecration it is called another thing; after the consecration it is called another thing: after the consecration it is called blood. And you say, Amen; that is, it is true. *What the mouth utters, let the mind inwardly confess. What the word resounds, let the heart inwardly respond to.*" So says St. Ambrose. And are all these words idly and profusely lavished in order to prove that bread after the consecration still remains bread, and that wine after consecration still remains wine?—*St. Ambrosius, de Initiandis, lib. viii. tom. iv. fol. 350. Parisiis, 1603.*

Again, "33. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world."

So that it is evident that our blessed Lord alludes not to any thing bordering on the Protestant sacrament, but points to himself directly.

"35. And Jesus said unto them, I

am the bread of life ; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

Behold, a second time our blessed Lord affirms that the bread of life is he himself ; and where is the Christian who shall dare to contradict him, and to exclaim, No, the bread of life came not down from heaven, but is the product of a terrestrial soil ?

"36. But I say also unto you, That ye also have seen me, and believe not."

"37. All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will no wise cast out."

Is it not manifest that our blessed Saviour here alludes, in the first place, to those who were about to *murmur at him*, and to reject *the bread from heaven*, and to *walk no more with him* ? and in the next place, to those who were about to tell him, in the words of Simon Peter, "*Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life.*"

"41. The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven."

Is it possible that these Jews could have murmured at him had he merely said, "The bread of life which I am about to give you is the common bread, which is eaten by you all, and which, when I shall be no more among you, it is my will that ye should eat in remembrance of me ?" No ; it would, methinks, require no peculiar assistance from the Holy Spirit for a person to make up his mind to believe in the possibility of a thing so very easy to be accomplished. However, after this murmur, it is but natural to expect that our blessed Lord would have taken some pains to disabuse them of their error, as Protestants assert

the tenet to be, according to which we believe that in this Sacrament he gives us his own flesh to eat. But no ; the blessed Jesus affords them new matter for discontent and perplexity.

"43. Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves."

"44. No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him : and I will raise him up at the last day."

Had our Saviour meant to give unto his followers nothing but mere bread and wine, would he not here have endeavoured to allay their murmurs instead of studiously increasing them ? Where would be the necessity that *the Father should draw* a man to believe a thing so easy as the Protestant interpretation of the Sacrament ?

But, to pursue the subject : We hear our Saviour a third time repeating, that the bread which they were about to eat is no other than *himself*.

"47. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

Notice here the solemnity of our Saviour's diction : "Verily, verily !" Does this confirmatory asseveration, redoubled, savour of figure or parable to the object that was to constitute that bread ? A third time he says—

"50. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die."

A fourth time he says—

"51. I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever ; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Now is the time for the exertion of a spiritual, a celestialized, not a gross, carnal, and corrupted eye,

in examining the import of his words.

The "*living bread!*" Can this expression be referred to the perishable, corruptible food, that passes among men by the name of bread? But mark with slow and solemn pace of understanding, the words that follow—

"And the bread that I will give is *my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*"

O candid and impartial Protestant! let me here entreat thee, in the name of that all-holy Personage from whose lips these words were uttered; canst thou possibly persuade thyself that our blessed Saviour speaks but of the bread of earth, that is kneaded with mere flour and water? What! was that species of bread *given for the life of the world?* Was that bread crucified? Or, was it not rather the *flesh of Him* that suffered for our sins, the eating of which, in his own language, was to make a man *live for ever?*

But, to leave awhile the soul-reviving words of our adored Redeemer, listen to the harsh, discordant, and rebellious voice of the first Protestants of whom history makes mention.

"52. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

Who can answer to this *how?* Shall we too exclaim with those incredulous disciples who first protested against his divine words, and with the host of incredulous Protestants who have since followed their example, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* Shall we exclaim with the philosophic Christian of modern times, "*Non credo, quia contra naturam est*" — (I believe it not, because it is contrary to nature); or with the simple-minded, and yet infinitely more philosophic Catholic Christian, if the true mean-

ing of words be weighed, "*Crede, quia ipse Dominus naturæ dixit!*" — (I believe, because the Lord of nature has himself averred it!)

Thus far, however, the Catholic and Protestant may differ as to our Saviour's real meaning; one thing is certain, and cannot be disputed—that the natural meaning of our Saviour's words led those murmuring Jews to conclude that he wished them to understand he intended them to eat his flesh. Now let us suppose for a moment that a modern Protestant preacher, in reading the Testament to young persons whom he was about to instruct in Christianity, and who previously had heard nothing either of the Catholic or the Protestant tenet on the subject—let us suppose, I say, that the zealous preacher, by dint of emphatical repetition, had involuntarily produced the same effect in the minds of his pupils which Christ produced in the minds of those Jews, who, upon hearing him, exclaimed, "*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*" Would not the preacher, let me ask, hasten to disabuse them of their error? Of course, you will reply, he would. And is it not equally natural to expect that the great Preacher of preachers, the sacred Oracle, the Fountain of truth, in *whose lips there was no guile*, would have been solicitous to undeceive and enlighten his disciples as to his meaning, had the taking of mere bread and wine in remembrance of him been the object to which all his language was directed?

Alas for the Protestant! how contrary to this is the mode pursued upon the occasion by the great Instructor! Instead of softening or qualifying his expression, he gives it now, for the *fifth time*, redoubled hardness—

"53. Then Jesus said unto

them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

Is language like this calculated to inform the murmuring Jews that he meant nothing by the solemn emphasis of *Verily, verily*, but *Figuratively, figuratively*; and by the words, the *flesh* and *blood*, nothing but mere *bread* and *wine*?

But again, a sixth time, he repeats:—

"54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Does our blessed Saviour in this verse advance one single step nearer to the Protestant interpretation—namely, mere bread and wine? or, is he about to do it the seventh time, which the next verse has recorded?

"55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

What solemn language! And is it all intended for the sole purpose of showing that there is vital nourishment in earthly bread, and the same in earthly wine?

Now let us hear him for the eighth time, and see whether we can make, at length, any nearer approach to Protestantism?

"56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him."

Were not, let me ask, the poor Jews excusable at least in misapprehending his meaning, if all this time nothing but bread and wine was meant by these constantly reiterated sounds of *flesh* and *blood*, however inexcusable they were in not remaining to learn with all docility from their divine Master, the *spirit* of his words?

But perhaps the Protestant may indulge some gleam of hope from

the ninth time, in which our Saviour explains the meaning:—

"57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."

O Jesus, Jesus! O my God! O ever-blessed Redeemer of my soul! is it possible that a disciple of thine, after this solemn oath which thou hast just pronounced, can still waver in his thoughts, or delay one moment in bowing down all the faculties of his soul, and in exclaiming aloud, in the language of primitive unreformed Christianity—πιστευω, πιστευω, πιστευω, και ομολογω εως εσχατης αναπνοης, οτι αυτη εστιν η σαρξ η ζωοποιος, ην λαβες, Χριστε, ο Θεος ημων, εκ της αγιας Δεσποινης ημων, θεοτοκου, και αιειπαρθενου Μαρίας. — *Liturgia St. Basilii Alexandrina*, ex Codice Græco, Arabio Edit. Renaudot, tom. i. p. 123. "I believe, I believe, I believe, and I confess until my latest breath, that this is the life-giving flesh, which thou tookest, O Christ, our God, from our holy Lady Mother of God, and ever-Virgin Mary."

Yes—Σωμα αγιον και αιμα τιμιον, αληθινον Ίησον Χριστον υιου του Θεου. Αμην.—*Id.* "The holy body and the precious true blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Amen."

Σωμα και αιμα, Εμμανουηλ του Θεου, τουτο εστιν αληθως. Αμην.—*Id.* "The body and blood of Emmanuel our God, this is verily. Amen."

Here, at least, the most stubborn opponent of Catholicity will allow, that, had our blessed Saviour intended to convey the meaning of flesh and blood, he could not have used words of a stronger nature, words more significant of that intent, and, at the same time, words more remote from Protestant conception of what our Saviour intended to express.

But come we now to the tenth time; perhaps the enigma, if our Saviour was of deliberate purpose dark and involved in his expression, may be at length explained.

"58. This is the bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

To what, or rather to whom, do the words "this bread" refer? Is it not to our Saviour himself? If so, will it still be maintained by Protestants that he had nothing in view but mere bread and wine; and that over and over again he thought it necessary to repeat, that that bread came down from heaven? After this solemn repetition of his meaning, ten times, so as to exclude all possibility of being misunderstood by those to whom he addressed his words, will it still be contended that he meant by his flesh bread, and by his blood wine? and by the bread that came down from heaven, he meant the wheat that grows on earth? Why, really, as a man endued with common sense and common reasoning powers, not as either Catholic or Protestant, if I were desirous to know what our Saviour meant, I would rather turn my attention to the preceding and succeeding verses of this said sixth chapter, than to all the doctors on either side of the question, that ever took the pen in hand to write either *pro* or *con* on the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

"60. Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard *this*, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?"

It appears at last that after this lengthy and persevering attempt of our blessed Saviour to convince the stubborn Jews that he really meant what he said, his words had not the due effect. If it be asked why,

the answer is obvious: "*No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him.*"

Well, but now at least we may expect that our Saviour would condescend to give the Protestant interpretation of the Sacrament, if bread and wine was what he really meant by flesh and blood! Now mark attentively the answer which the lips of unerring Truth gave to those sons of incredulity, those Jews, or rather those Judaic Protestants, that first murmured against him!

"61. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you?"

"62. What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?"

Had our blessed Saviour intended to convey the meaning of bread and wine taken in remembrance of himself after his departure from earth, is this, think ye, the mode by which he would have explained that meaning? "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?"—that is, When ye shall see with your own eyes the Son of Man ascending to heaven, will ye still doubt the possibility of my words, which now seem to you a *hard saying*, and which now *offend you*, being true—ay, literally true—even as shall be my ascent to heaven? When ye shall have seen me ascend, and when ye shall be persuaded by ocular demonstration that I have ascended, will ye still require ocular demonstration to be convinced that, when the words of consecration have been pronounced, the bread becomes my flesh, and the wine becomes my blood indeed? No, ye will not: no, ye cannot, if ye believe indeed that I *have the words of eternal life*.

During all this time that our

blessed Saviour has been addressing his disciples, we may observe, that, as he never once diverted his words from eating his flesh and drinking his blood, so the Jews never could divert their thoughts from that gross carnal manner of eating, which contributes to the support of animal life. They most incontrovertibly persuaded themselves that he meant to inculcate that doctrine, and could not prevail with their reason to assent to its possibility.

The next verse, however, which I am about to quote, is, according to the inculcation of Protestants, not only explanatory of all the preceding ones, but of all that follow, and sets in their minds the whole question at rest for ever. It is this:

“63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”

Now, independently of the Catholic doctrine on this subject, where the glorified body of our blessed Saviour, though received by the faithful, is still spiritual, not corporeal food—in the language of St. Ambrose, “In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi: non ergo corporalis esca sed spiritualis est”—(In that sacrament Christ is, because it is the body of Christ: it is not *therefore* corporeal but spiritual food;)—independently, I say, of this immutable doctrine of the Catholic Church, whosoever is versed in Scriptural language will not fail to recollect that *the flesh* frequently bears the meaning of the corporeal senses, in contradistinction to *the spirit*, which bears that of the grace of God and the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly in St. Matthew we find our blessed Saviour thus speaking to Peter, who had just said to him, “Thou art the Christ, the

Son of the living God.” (Matt. xvi. 16.)

“17. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for *flesh and blood* hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.”

Besides, as a Catholic writer has before observed, if this speech were spoken in the sense of the Sacramentarians, it would take away Christ's incarnation, manhood and death, no less than his corporeal presence in the Sacrament; for his flesh were not profitable, if all these were vain.

See ye not, then, my Protestant brethren, that, in this sense of the words *flesh and blood*, the carnal-minded Jews could not easily have comprehended the spirituality of such a banquet as that which has just been described to you by the great St. Ambrose? Most undoubtedly the flesh—that is, the carnally enchained faculties of the mind in men of such a description—*profits nothing* in penetrating the real nature of this ineffable mystery. It is by the *quickenings spirit*—that is, by irradiation from above, by the influx of Divine grace, that the soul of man, if I may use the expression, becomes cured of all its peccant humours, and enabled to discern it, obeying the tradition of that Church which has never ceased to explain it to all her children. Our Saviour, therefore, alluding to those in whom he knew that this *flesh and blood* predominated, says (John vi. 64.)—“But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.”

In explaining this passage according to the Catholic doctrine, the whole chapter is made to bear a harmony and consent that renders it perfectly intelligible: all is order

and coherence. But once admit the Protestant doctrine, and the tendency of the whole chapter, however particular verses may be plausibly interpreted, is perfectly irreconcilable with the laws of sense, the accordance of grammar, and the rules of logic; all is confusion and irregularity. To prove this, let us examine why our blessed Saviour in this place, (for nothing could possibly be more out of place, had he simply alluded to the taking of mere bread and wine,) exclaims, "But there are some of you that believe not." Is it not obvious that, *faith* being a gratuitous gift of God, he alludes to those whose gross senses could not, if I may use a Scripture phrase, *put on incorruption*, so as to be able to discern in this sacrament the Lord of glory, not the mere product of earth, and perishable matter? Accordingly, our Divine Instructor continues, in the next verse, to show the impossibility of obtaining belief by the aid of flesh and blood—that is, of our corrupted reason, whatever its natural perspicacity may be, unenlightened by the presiding Spirit.

"65. And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father."

No, most indisputably, no man in this awful sacrament can, in the language of St. Paul, discern the *Lord's body*, who is himself a mere compound of *flesh and blood* unilluminated by the eye of faith.

"66. From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

Why did they go back, and walk no more with their Divine Master? Was it not because they had the gross stupidity to imagine, that when he said, "the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," (John

vi. 51,) he meant that they should eat his dead inanimate flesh, instead of receiving him, who, in the words of St. Epiphanius, *εν τουτω τω σωματι αναληφθεις ενδοξως, εκαθισεν εν δεξια του Πατρος, ουκ απο του ογκου πιεζομενος, ουκ εκτος του σωματος υπαρχων, το δε σωμα πνευματικον εγειρας*, (*St. Epiph. p. 1023. Ed. Pet.*) "in that same body magnificently uplifted into heaven, sat down at the right hand of the Father, unincumbered by any corporeal clogs, though not divested of the body which he raised in his spiritualized glory."

"67. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?"

Tell me, ye Protestants, what means this appeal of our blessed Saviour? Does it mean "Will ye also abandon me, scandalized at the harmless institution of taking a little bread and wine in remembrance of me after my departure," as Protestants interpret it? or does it not rather mean, "Will ye also leave me, calling in question the veracity of my words, For my flesh is meat *indeed*, and my blood is drink *indeed*?"—(John vi. 55.)

"68. Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life."

Oh! how natural was it that the sacred Head of the true Church should speak, upon this occasion, the language which that same Church was destined to speak until the very end of time,—"Lord, to whom shall we go?" Yes, Peter answered in the name of all Catholic posterity, hearing the words uttered from the Divine mouth, that "the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven," (33); "I am the bread of life," (35); and "the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (51)—Is it possible that I

can ever go to any new master, who shall unteach me all thy heavenly doctrine, persuading me that thou meanest not what thou sayest, but that thou alludest solely to "the meat which perisheth," not to that meat "*which endureth to everlasting life*?" (John vi. 27.)

But listen. Peter decides at once the whole point in contest between Catholic and Protestant, and in one half sentence speaks more copiously than ten thousand volumes. The words are (and they are addressed to Christ)—"Thou hast the words of eternal life."

We have only now, in conclusion, to examine with methodical deduction what the words are, and all disputes will vanish, no men *striving* any longer *among* themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

The words are these—and oh, may they sink deeply into the breast of every Protestant that reads them! But, above all, let him bear in mind that, if they appear irresistible in support of Catholicity when read, as below, abstractedly from the context, their effulgence in illustrating the same cause is overpowering in a tenfold degree when read in conjunction with the whole body of evidence, as it stands in the sixth chapter of the sacred volume of St. John.

"51. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is *my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world."

I shall only, in the conclusion of this chapter, observe, that to adapt all this to mere bread and wine, were to gratify one's prejudices at the expense of common sense and sound understanding.

[Here the learned gentleman's hour terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It cannot have escaped the penetrating discernment of this audience, that I have not received one solitary reply to the multitude of vital questions which I reiterated and pressed upon my learned and ingenious opponent. I quoted passage after passage, and told him I was placed in a serious perplexity, that either I must construe those words, "This is my body," in a figurative sense—the ordinary sense adopted by his own Church—or I must infer, if he insists on the literal interpretation, that "Agar, a mountain," was turned into a "woman," that "the seven candlesticks" were transubstantiated into "seven churches," and that my ingenious opponent is "grass," instead of being flesh and blood. I told him I was placed in this awkward dilemma—that if I must retain the words literally, and say, "This is my body," means, this is transubstantiated into my body, instead of taking them in their figurative acceptance, and saying, this is a sign or a symbol of my body, I must also retain the literal interpretation of all passages which I quoted, and understand them as conveying acts of transubstantiation also. But if I maintain the figurative sense of "This is my body," then all these passages are harmonious and full of meaning.

Whatever mode of interpretation we adopt, must be carried out. My question that I wish answered is, Which am I to adopt? Am I to adopt the literal of "the Council of Trent," and of "the Catechism of the Council of Trent," and be thereby plunged into all those monstrous imaginations and delusions which I have supposed? or am I to adopt, as the Church of Rome does herself adopt, the figurative interpretation of these thirty-seven passages, and thereby of necessity and consistency

attach to the passage, "this is my body," a figurative interpretation also? I place Mr. French on the horns of this dilemma; if he leave one, I catch him on the other: on one, or the other, he now is. I have not yet, however, got an answer on which horn I am permitted to leave him impaled. The Church of Rome applies the *figurative* to all the passages I quoted, and, but for some mysterious reason, which nobody knows, retains a *literal* and *extraordinary* interpretation for these words—"This is my body." If she retain Transubstantiation, she must hide herself in inconsistencies, or plunge into ten thousand *monstra horrenda*.

My opponent commenced his reply by some genealogical *stemmata*, making our parentage, as Protestants, three hundred years old, and giving us Luther as our father; but, before he had done, he, most kindly and condescendingly, gave us the sceptic Jews in the sixth of John to be our fathers, making a difference of some fifteen hundred years in our lineage. Now, all I wish to know is, whom he will have to be our fathers? Luther, who he said was our father, or the sceptic Jews, on whom he conferred the same title, or whether I am to construe his words figuratively or literally, or what, in fact, I am to make of them? On a former occasion, he quoted Thomas Aquinas, and treated us with an extract from the poetic productions of that learned and "seraphic doctor." I, on the other hand, showed you a specimen of the learned doctor's prose, in order that, catching the doctor, not in his rapt and elevated moods, under the dominion of the Muses, but in his calm, closet, and deliberate cogitations; we might the more effectually ascertain what metal this same Aquinas was made of,

and what was the theology of his Church. My opponent, notwithstanding his commending me to the writings of Aquinas for pure Roman Catholic doctrines, to my surprise repudiated the sentiments of Aquinas, as soon as I read his words. To show, nevertheless, that Mr. French was quite correct in referring me to the writings of Aquinas for the doctrines of his Church, notwithstanding the doctor's insisting on the extermination of heretics, I beg to refer you to the Breviary, which every Roman Catholic priest uses, and not only to the Breviary, but also to the "Missal for the use of the laity," p. 560. Lond. 1810. In these two documents we find a prayer referring to Aquinas. So that *every Roman Catholic* in this room prays, on the proper day, that he may understand and follow Aquinas, that sanguinary exterminator of heretics.

"O God, who, by the wonderful learning of blessed Thomas, thy confessor, hast illustrated thy Church, and by his virtues hast enlarged it, grant, we beseech thee, that *we may understand what he taught, and in our lives follow what he practised.*" —*Missal for Laity*, p. 560.

I told you what he taught—the most intolerant, the most anti-social, the most sanguinary extermination of heretics. What did he practise, or rather, what did he preach? For if Thomas Aquinas was a consistent man, surely, he would preach what he practised, and practise what he preached. But he *taught* "the extermination of heretics;" and now will my learned opponent explain to me, by what extraordinary sympathy it is, that the recognition of this exterminator by fire and faggot should be found in the Missal, a book which is intended for the sanctuary, in which "mercy and peace ought to meet together, and righteousness and truth to kiss each other?"

How comes it to pass that, in the centre of a public manual of prayers for public worship, poor men should be referred to so dreadful an example, and taught to pray "that we may be edified by what he, the persecutor, taught, and in our lives, follow what he practised?"—Thus much for Aquinas. To what authority did the learned gentleman go next, do you think? Right way to Luther: I can also tell him something about Luther too. In the first place, he never worshipped "bread and wine," for he held the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, and *not Transubstantiation*; in the second place, for so doing he is placed under the *anathema* of the Council of Trent, so that my learned opponent ought to have quoted very little from Martin Luther, considering the treatment he has received at the hands of Rome; and, in the last place, let me add, I hold no man to be my pope—neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor Knox. I am not responsible for their sentiments, nor have they any authority over mine. I appeal from *Luther to Christ*, from the *volumes of the reformers* to the pages of the Gospel—the ever-living truths of God! All this ingenious discussion respecting Aquinas, and Luther, and Calvin, just goes for what it is worth in my estimate, and I account it worth nothing. That brought my friend within an inch of the Bible. To the Bible, and the Bible alone, I would appeal. The Bible was his last reference, with the exception of his closing remarks, where he introduced a little sample from his own, no doubt excellent and very laudable writings. To the Bible I will soon follow him with the utmost pleasure and satisfaction. The learned gentleman gave the credit of all impressions of truth that might be produced on your minds, to certain personal peculiari-

ties. Now, I never like compliment: I always recollect the words of the poet, "*Frigidus latet anguis in herba*," when strong personal compliments are paid me. I utterly disclaim them, and I assure you, my dear friends, that I am a most defective and unpractised "special pleader;" I am not like my opponent, a "barrister-at-law," accustomed to detect all the subtleties and sophisms of an adversary, and to bring out and expose sophisms in the most clear, lucid, and convincing analysis. To this detective work my opponent is so accustomed, that when you heard his statements, you did not listen to a rustic coming forward to argue in a rugged and illiterate style; but you heard an acute, subtle, and well-read lawyer endeavour to vindicate the doctrine of Transubstantiation, where failure must be in the cause, not in the man; whereas in me you see one merely accustomed to address a popular audience in plain and popular language. I am not accustomed to special pleading, to subtleties, and ingenious warfare; and, therefore, if any result should be produced on your minds, my dear Roman Catholic friends, or if any has been, I earnestly desire that you may attribute it, not to me, nor to "Paul, nor to Apollos, nor to Cephas," but to truth. I solemnly assure you of the fact, that "the victory is neither by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." (Applause, and cries of "Order.")

After my learned opponent had discussed Aquinas, and other extraneous subjects, into which I do not wish to follow him, for the question is "Transubstantiation," and I do insist that we keep close to our point, and discuss it fully, fairly, and impartially; after he had introduced Aquinas, and kicked him

overboard, and likewise Luther, and treated him with similar *nonchalance*, as the Council of Trent had done before him, he came to Berrington and Kirk—*arcades ambo*—who had written some defensive statements on the Roman Catholic faith, and from them he quoted a very plausible exposition of Transubstantiation. I do not regard Berrington and Kirk, or Mr. French, as standards of the Roman Church; they are not of any authority in the Church of Rome. My opponent will admit that they are of no more authority than he admits Dens to be: they are able, but mere private, doctors, ingenious men, pleased to deliver their sentiments on Roman Catholic tenets, and convey them to posterity in type and letter-press, well bound, and closely locked together. I cannot take any interpretation of Messrs. Berrington and Kirk; I must go to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which is declared to be an authentic document of the Church of Rome; my opponent must remember his own standards, for I find that my friend is getting into years, that his locks are silvered by time, and his memory may very naturally have failed him. I do not speak it harshly: I do not speak it insultingly—God forbid! But his memory must have failed him in reference to the quotations which I made from the documents of his own Church.

I must recur to definitions again. I find it stated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, that the pastors must explain, that not only the true body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as the *bones* and *nerves*, but also that entire Christ is contained in this sacrament. This is authentic doctrine. Berrington and Kirk are of no weight, and Mr. French would properly call me to

account, were I to refer to *private* for public standards. I read from the "Canon of the Council of Trent," where I am declared under an *anathema* if I deny that "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God," are present on the table and altar of the Church of Rome. And, therefore, appealing to the Canons of the Council of Trent, to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, to the standard and accredited documents of the Church of Rome, I find that the interpretation of "Berrington and Kirk" is the interpretation of mere private doctors, whose authority is scouted by their Church, and worth nothing.

You remember, my learned friend seriously objected, that when he was referring to the Gospel of St. Matthew, I placed the Bible before him, and referred him to the Gospel of St. Luke. He has taken the Gospel of St. Matthew, where it is asserted, "This is my body, this is my blood." Well, then, he shall have my quotations from St. Matthew, since he complains of my taking them from St. Luke. I go to St. Matthew; I take the challenge. I read St. Matthew xxvi. 29. *After, mark you, after the prayer of consecration*, I read, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of *this fruit of the vine*, until that day when I shall drink it new with you, in my Father's kingdom." Mark you, it is called "*this fruit of the vine*," after consecration, after prayer, after the *transubstantiatory act*. "I will not drink of *this fruit of the vine*." The words are not of *this blood*, which, according to Rome, it had become, but "*this fruit of the vine*." The learned gentleman has drawn me to the Gospel of St. Matthew in preference to that of St. Luke, to which he would not allow me to go. Well, I have done it, and now proclaim

that St. Matthew was not a believer in Transubstantiation, for by him our Lord declares the contents of the chalice, "the fruit of the vine," WINE, after the prayer which transubstantiates, according to the Church of Rome, has been offered. Now, if I ask the learned gentleman, or his Church, is it the blood of Christ, or is it *wine* that remains on the altar after the consecrating prayer? both tell me at once, plainly and distinctly, it is the *blood* of Christ, it is *not wine*. I go to the Gospel of Matthew, and I ask the holy evangelist what it is after consecration, and he tells me it is *wine*. Now, am I to believe the Church of Rome, which says it is "the blood of Christ," or am I to believe the sacred evangelist, who says it is "the fruit of the vine?" What must I conclude? Most surely truth compels the assertion, however kindly charity may dictate the expression, that the sacred Evangelist is right, and my antagonist with his Church fatally and awfully wrong.

In the Gospel of Luke, it is called "the fruit of the vine" *before* the consecration of the elements, and in the Gospel of Matthew, it is called "the fruit of the vine" *after* consecration. Now, perhaps Mr. French will say, Luke and Matthew contradict each other; this neither he nor I will admit. We explain it by a fact, perfectly true of all the evangelists, that one relates one occurrence more fully than another. Thus, for instance, St. Matthew and St. Luke give narrations, undoubtedly, which St. John does not give; and all we infer from this is, that one evangelist gives a fuller narration of particular circumstances, than another feels it his call from heaven to give. And therefore we say both are true; it is perfectly true what Luke asserts, that it was wine

before consecration: I and my opponent agree in this;—the real question is, what is it called *after*? St. Matthew says it is "the *fruit* of the vine." This is decisive against its being the literal blood of Christ—"it is the fruit of the vine."

I may here mention an allusion I have jotted down, according to which my friend thanked God that I had not "the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Now I do not thank God that *he* has not; I pray God that he may know where these keys are to be found, and that to him may be revealed speedily those glorious truths, which, like ploughshares, will pass through the fantastic imaginations of man, and indicate the simple and ennobling truth, as it is revealed in the Gospel.

My opponent quoted, as proof of Transubstantiation, another passage, 1 Cor. x. 16 :—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" He believes the words, "is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" to prove that we actually participate of Christ's literal body. But let my opponent mark the expression which occurs in this quotation, "we break." My opponent holds there is a *whole Christ* in every particle of the Host—that, if divided into twenty thousand parts, there would be a whole Christ in every single part. But the apostle says, "the bread which *we break*," and if that bread be the corporeal body of Christ, we actually *break* that body, and thus, the proofs of Transubstantiation assumed by my opponent, are *disproofs* on his own showing. If he says that the expression, "the communion of the body of Christ" denotes *actual participation* of his natural body, then must the

apostle's words, "fellowship with devils," denote incorporation into their nature. It means, evidently, in the spiritual blessings of the body of Christ, the precious benefits of his love, peace, joy, holiness, happiness, grace, faith, hope, and full and eternal fruition of his glory. Thus there are two texts quoted by my friend which turn out, when plainly met, examined, and analyzed, to militate most powerfully against him, instead of for him, confirming the position with which I commenced, that when you wish to crush the argument of a Roman Catholic, you had best go to the very texts he quotes, and you will find the most complete extinguishers there. [Laughter, and cries of "Order!"]

My ingenious antagonist, after these mistakes, entered into a discussion on the Rule of Faith. I have the happiness to announce, that, that question will be discussed on a subsequent evening, and I am fully prepared, while God gives me strength and grace, to meet him on that subject; on this and every other question I implore my Roman Catholic friends, to think and weigh the truth they hear. Oh, do not let, either the variety or the beauty of your forms and ceremonies, or the loud pretensions of the Church of Rome, and her votaries, dazzle and delude you! These forms are no evidence of her mercy or truth. They are the gilding of death—the drapery of evil. They remind one of the vampire, which, when it stings a person, flutters over and fans him with its wings, to prevent him from feeling the power and penetration of the sting, until at last it enters into the quick and destroys the principle of life; so the Church of Rome beclouds with incense, and dazzles with ceremonial splendour, to deceive; but all

the while her stings pierce to the heart, and "the issue is death." After discussing the Rule of Faith—which I shall not touch to-night, feeling that a subject, so extensive and important, requires a separate night—the next topic of my antagonist was Communion in One Kind.

Now, we came to discuss Transubstantiation; but he strikes off from it to talk about communion in one kind, and the merits of the English translation, and the propriety of the translation of the Greek words *η* and *καί*. His church contends for communion in one kind, though both kinds are, on his own principles, enjoined in the 6th chapter of John:—"Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man," &c.; but he says, just now, if you *eat* the *flesh*, the *blood* is contained in the *flesh*: but "*drink* the *blood*" is the expression used by the evangelist; it is not, you will observe, *eat* the *flesh* that contains the *blood*, but "*DRINK*." What, now, will my learned friend say? Will he reply, this is only a figure? Why then, let me ask, does he so continually ply me with twits and taunts as to "tropes and orientalisms," when he is so extravagantly guilty of such orientalisms, as to assert, that *eating* *flesh* means *drinking* *blood*, yet *figurative*, *figurative*, is the sin he has anathematized and rejected every time he has risen?

Again, since the subject of Communion in One Kind has been introduced, I will, *en passant*, reply to one or two of his points in this digression. He quoted the passage:—"Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," as a mis-translation in our authorized version. I admit that *η* is more probably correct; nay,

I give up this whole matter, if he pleases, and say it is η , "or," and that our translators erroneously used "and." I acknowledge that our English translation, which Dr. Doyle declared to be "a noble production, with all its faults," has imperfections, but if all its errors were corrected, you would find they would only tell more in favour of those glorious, indubitable, and distinctive truths—the deity of Christ, the offices and personality of the Holy Spirit, expiation through the blood of Christ, and through that alone, and sanctification by the Spirit. But suppose I concede this to be a mis-translation, and read, "whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* (η) drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." I say this proves not communion in one kind; if I eat the bread "unworthily," I am "guilty of the body and blood of Christ." If I drink the cup "unworthily," I am "guilty of the body and blood of Christ also," just as if I break the law in one point, I am guilty of all. But I go down the chapter to see the apostle's explanation of his meaning, and I read (as in the 26th) in the 29th verse:—"For he that eateth AND drinketh unworthily, eateth AND drinketh damnation to himself." Now, if you eat the bread unworthily, you are guilty of his body and blood, if you drink this cup unworthily, you are guilty of both. And therefore we feel that "eating *and* drinking" must necessarily explain "eating *or* drinking." But the Church of Rome says, "communion in one kind is here proved." I call on my learned antagonist to explain how this doctrine was never detected from this text before, why, for *eleven centuries* they permitted the laity to have the cup, and then withdrew it? I ask

this startling question, and pause for a reply.

MR. FRENCH.—Shall I give you a reply—do you wish a reply now? If so, I will give you one.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Very well.

MR. FRENCH then rose and said, in explanation,—During the first centuries of the Church, down to the earliest period, we received, by books and by tradition, from the earliest times of the apostles, that it (*i. e.* the Eucharist) was often administered in *liquid*, and often administered in dry, that is, the *Host* alone. Several instances have occurred of this kind. That of St. Ambrose receiving only the Host on his death-bed is an historical fact; and we have—

REV. J. CUMMING.—Is my statement the fact?

MR. FRENCH.—Yes it is; and in consequence of spilling the wine, and other indecorous things, such as spilling what we call "the precious blood of the Saviour," it was administered in this manner. It is now generally administered in one kind. The discipline of our Church on that point is favourable, but it is always an article of the Catholic faith, that he who receives it in one kind, receives all—

REV. J. CUMMING.—Now am I right?

MR. FRENCH (in continuation).—And in some countries, to this day, it is received in both kinds.

REV. J. CUMMING.—That is precisely all I want. It is plain that the body and blood, the bread and the cup, *were formerly given to the laity*. It is equally plain *both* are *not* given now. Delahogue says, "It is evident that from the time of the apostles till the 12th century, the practice prevailed in the Roman Church, that the laity received the Eucharist in both kinds, as is now the case in the Greek

Church. But from the 12th century the practice or the faithful receiving only in one kind among the Latins *gradually crept in*."—*Tractat. de Eucharistia.* Art. ii. p. 214.

Therefore, it is at once admitted, that the custom prevailed of having both the bread and the cup for eleven centuries, until the Church of Rome, for strange reasons, which my learned friend has tried to explain, withdrew it. What was the reason? He says, their "spilling the blood of the Son of God"—"*spilling the blood of the Son of God!!!*" It was withdrawn on that account! Strange reason! that after for *eleven* centuries the CUP and the BREAD had been permitted, the cup should be withdrawn in the twelfth, because "the people spilled its contents," which contents Protestants pronounce to be wine, but which Roman Catholics pronounce to be the blood of the Son of God! Perhaps, my learned friend will answer the question, whether it is the *practice* now to give the bread and wine both together? I am bold to say, *not*; and this being the case, I proceed to show, that there are some reasons, and those not light reasons, why the LAITY as well as the priests should be admitted to drink of the cup, and no tribunal on earth have power to debar. Our Lord, according to Matthew, "took the cup, and said, Drink ye ALL of it." Matt. xxvi. 27. Now, the apostles, I contend, at the Lord's Supper drank under both kinds—for Christ said, "Drink ye *all* of it;" but the Church of Rome will not allow all to partake; the officiating priest alone, and it may be sometimes, the other priests, communicating with him, if I am not mistaken, are allowed to drink of it.

Again, our Lord says, in verse

28:—"This is my blood of the New Testament, which *is* shed for many for the remission of sins—drink ye ALL of it. (The Church of Rome has, it '*shall be shed*!') He has a reason for giving this cup, because it was representative of that blood, through which we alone have remission of sins." And is not remission of sins a truth in which the laity have as deep an interest as the priest; and if the cup be the symbol or seal of remission of sins, then I do say I am bound, not to make my charity the grave of truth, but to assert fearlessly, as well as faithfully, that the Church which takes the cup from the laity is guilty of sacrilege.

I quote Mark xiv. 23:—"And they ALL drank of it." Strange that the evangelist should be so particular in introducing the expression ALL. He took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them; it is not enough merely to say "they," but he adds with characteristic emphasis, "they ALL drank of it, and yet the cup is taken away by the Roman Church, and is not given to ALL. Again, you are aware, my friend has made an assertion, which I shall by-and-by disprove to you, that the 6th of John refers to the Eucharist. Now I go to the 6th of John, to which he has referred me, and which *he* holds to refer to the Lord's Supper, and in that chapter I find these words: "Except ye *eat* the flesh of the Son of Man AND *drink* his blood, ye have no life."

Now observe, *I* do not refer this to the Lord's Supper, but *he* does. "Unless ye eat the flesh AND drink"—(η) of course is not there, it is the Greek conjunction, KAI. I ask Mr. French how he gets over this dilemma?—"Except ye eat the flesh AND drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life." Mark that!

His solution is, that the blood is contained in the flesh. I reply, How can you say that EATING is DRINKING? It would be a strange "orientalism" that could produce this effect, and prove that eating is drinking, and drinking is eating. If so, it appears that Mr. French's mode of interpretation is ten thousand times more monstrosly oriental than we Protestants, "in our philosophy, ever dreamt of." I expect fully that, before this discussion is long closed, my opponent will become a sound and consistent Protestant [Laughter, and cries of "Order!"]—there is a power and simplicity in the Word of God, the effect of which I am perfectly sure will lead to delightful results: and I will not only congratulate my learned friend on such a happy and auspicious change, but, as well, those many open and ingenuous countenances of my Roman Catholic friends that I see around me in this room. I know they are persons of a frank and generous nature, with minds open to the truth, when fairly and affectionately stated, and especially when I tell them that I come, not to take away their civil rights, or to advocate the repeal of any of their immunities whatever; when I tell them that I come to seek not *theirs* but *them*, as it is my duty and my privilege to do; that there is a promise in the Word of God which imposes on them a tremendous weight of responsibility.—"My words shall not return unto me void." Some effect these words must produce. My friends, we must all meet again at the judgment-seat of Christ; you, my Roman Catholic friends, to give an account of what you have heard, and I to give an account of what I have stated; and I know that you will be judged, not according to the pretension or the profession of the

Church to which you belong, but you will be judged "in righteous judgment," according as you have either received or refused the testimony of the Son of God; and would it not be an awful thing, my friends, (I pray that it may never come to pass,) that my statements should prove to you "the savour of death unto death," instead of being "the savour of life unto life!" Only, I say, one or the other it certainly must be: and I have so knit myself with my dear Roman Catholic friends, in this room, this night—so connected myself with their souls "by my testimony!" that we must again confront each other before God; I therefore implore you to dismiss from your minds every thing that may prejudice you against the truth—even the ties connected with father and with mother—for "he that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me." Look through every thing merely splendid in a gorgeous ritual, or proud in ancient hierarchy, and bring your minds to the calm and deliberate disquisition of this matter, resolving, by God's grace, that if my arguments, reasonings, and expositions be right—and your own judgments which God has given you are fully competent to grasp them—you will unalterably cling to that side alone, "which has God for its author, truth without any mixture of error for its matter," and eternal happiness for its final and triumphant issue! [Sensation.]

My opponent insists that the sixth of John describes the Eucharist. The Church of Rome believes that infants baptized are universally saved, and yet these partake not of the Lord's Supper; but the language is absolute on Mr. French's own principle: "Except ye eat his flesh and drink his blood"—"except every one of you eat the flesh and

drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you ;” and therefore, if I say that this chapter refers to the Lord’s Supper, it renders the salvation of infants impossible. He brought forward several statements about the fathers, which it would be only a waste of time to repeat. The fathers, my friend will concur with me, are not infallible. Delahogue admits that they are guilty of many errors ; and I am prepared fully to prove that the fathers contradict each other, and each father his neighbour over and over again, whenever I am asked. But as he has referred to the fathers, suppose I quote from the fathers also—not, mind you, to substantiate my views, because I can substantiate them by the Word of God, without the aid of the fathers, but to neutralize their testimony.

I therefore quote from Origen, that you may see how he either contradicts the Roman Church or himself :—“The meat which is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer, as respects its material part, goes into the stomach ; . . . but as regards the prayer, which is added to it, according to the proportion of faith, it profits, enlightening the mind which beholds that which is profitable. Neither is it the matter of the bread, but the words spoken over it, which profit men that do eat not unworthily. And these things I speak of the *typical* and *symbolical* body.”—*Origen. Com. on Matt.* Rouen, 1668.

I have shown that Augustine is expressly opposed to Transubstantiation, and now here is Origen uniting with him in a kindred protest against the obnoxious dogma. I quote another father, viz. Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, A.D. 314 :—“For he gave again to his disciples the *symbols* of the divine economy, and he commanded them to

make the *image* of his own body.”—*Evang. Dem.* book viii. chap. i. Paris, 1544.

From the same :—“He appointed them to eat bread as a *symbol* of his own body.”

I quote from St. Augustine :—“If a passage is preceptive, and either forbids a crime or wickedness, or enjoins usefulness or charity, it is not figurative. But if it seem to command a crime or wickedness, or to forbid usefulness or kindness, it is *figurative*. ‘Unless ye shall eat,’ he says, ‘the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.’ He appears to enjoin wickedness as a crime. *It is a figure*, therefore, teaching us that we partake of the benefits of the Lord’s passion, and that we must sweetly and profitably treasure up in our memories, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us.”

—*Third Book on Christian Doctrine*, vol. iii. p. 52. Bened. Ed. Paris, 1685.

The same :—“How shall I put forth my hand to heaven, and lay hold of him who sitteth there? Put forth *your faith*, and you will have laid hold of him.”—*Fifth Treat. on 11th and 12th chap. of St. John*, vol. iii. p. 630. Ed. as above.

Again :—“Jesus answered and said to him, ‘This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent.’ To do this is to eat the meat which perishes not, but endures to eternal life. Why do you prepare your teeth and your stomach? Believe only, and you will have eaten.”—*25th Treat. on 6th John*, vol. iii. p. 490. Ed. *ibid.*

Again :—“This therefore is to eat that food and to drink that cup, viz. to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in you. And for this reason he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, beyond all doubt does

not spiritually eat his flesh or drink his blood, although he carnally presses with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ."—*26th Treat. on John*, vol. iii. p. 501.

I might extend similar extracts, but for what end do I quote them? I repeat it, to neutralize the extracts of my opponent. I cast the fathers overboard, and can afford to do so, with all these extracts and testimonies in my favour. My opponent quotes from the fathers passages which seem to imply Transubstantiation, and I quote passages which, if I am to adopt the literality of interpretation which he contends for, plainly denounce the novel tenet of Transubstantiation. Now, let me concede what is obvious, that if construed on the principle of my opponent, the fathers positively contradict each other, what then is the alternative? We just go to the *grandfathers*, St. Paul, and St. Matthew, and St. Mark, and St. Luke, and St. John, and St. Peter, and St. James, seeing that their professing progeny, the fathers, so contradict one another, that no confidence is to be reposed in their expositions of divinity. I go to the infallible Word of God. This is the only oracle of truth, the sole standard of perfection. To illustrate its superiority let me suppose, that on looking into the Thames, as it passes by Hammersmith, you were to see a taint, or colouring matter, of perhaps a poisonous nature—you would be anxious to know where that taint began, or whether it proceeded from the fountain-head. You begin to trace it upwards, till you come to Henley-upon-Thames; you go on still further, tracing it upwards, and you find the same taint as you proceed, but becoming less and less discernible, until it is scarcely perceptible, except by a microscope, or subtle

chemical analysis—a plain, blunt peasant, on seeing the ingenious and persevering inquirer, trying to find the precise part of the river at which this taint began, says, "Go to the fountain-head, and if you find the colour there, it belongs to the river, but if you do not find it there, it must have been added in its course, and is therefore extraneous to it." So say I; if, in exploring among the fathers, of whom my learned friend is so fond, we find Transubstantiation here and Purgatory there—Saint-worship in one, and Relic-worship in another, surely the plan for ascertaining if these tenets (on the supposition that they are to be found in the fathers) are the original inspiration of God, is to go to the primæval fountains, the oracles of heaven, and if there, they are right, if not there, they are of human birth and fallible authority. Now, I say to my friend, Mr. French, *Go* to the fountain; if you find Transubstantiation *there*, I will acquiesce in it at once, and embrace it as a dogma of faith; if you do not, and I am prepared to show it is not there, then let Mr. French come over to me.

My opponent next quoted a passage in his own book about Aaron's rod, and said it was seen to be a rod till Moses took hold of it, and it became a serpent. He then took the serpent by the tail, and it became a rod. My opponent mysteriously proves Transubstantiation by shaking alternately the rod and the serpent before your eyes, and perplexing where he cannot convince. Moses saw it to be a rod when it was a rod, and he saw it to be a serpent when it was a serpent; and of course was convinced, by his undeceived senses, that in the one case it was a rod, and in the other a serpent.

My opponent next transported us

to the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. The *onus probandi*, or the necessity of showing that the sixth of John refers directly to the Eucharist, belongs to my antagonist. First, then, I call on Mr. French to prove that John vi. does refer directly to the Lord's Supper. He says, "my impression is so and so." I do not want his impressions; I want arguments. After he has done this, he will be able to explain, for the honour of the Church, the contradictory testimonies she contains on this point.

Cardinal Cameracensis:—"Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Holy Writ."—*In 4, d. 11. q. 6. Art. 1, 2.*

Cardinal Roffensis, Cardinal Cajetan, and also Scotus, (*in 4 sent. d. 11. q. 3.*) all concur in the same thing.

It is clear these distinguished names in the Roman Catholic Church were not possessed of eyesight so keen as my learned opponent, who sees it plainly in the sixth chapter of John.

Bellarmino enumerates the following Roman Catholic doctors who give the Protestant interpretation of one of the most important texts, (John vi. 54,) viz. Gabriel, Nicolas Cusan, Thomas Cajetan, Tapper, John Hessel, and Cornelius Jansen.

I now refer to a passage of the Council of Trent, which contains the sentiments of the Church of Rome on the sixth of John:—"Neither is it truly to be gathered from that saying in the sixth of John, that communion in both kinds was taught by our Lord; however it be understood by us, ACCORDING TO THE VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS OF THE HOLY FATHERS AND DOCTORS."—Chap. i. sess. 21.

"The various interpretations of the fathers!" (I thought the fathers were "*unanimous*!") My friend says he will "not interpret Scrip-

ture unless according to the unanimous consent of the fathers; but the fathers have various opinions. Mark that! one holds one view at one time, and another view at another. Then I ask my learned friend how he is to explain this article of Pope Pius's Creed, that he will "not interpret the Bible unless according to the unanimous consent of the fathers?" Mr. French in that creed has declared that he will "not interpret Scripture, unless according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." Now, when I show, as I am showing at this moment, that there is no such thing as "the unanimous consent of the fathers," what is it but an actual padlock on my friend's powers of interpretation, so that he must not dare to interpret Scripture until he has got what is not to be had—their *unanimous consent*. [Laughter, and cries of "Order!"] Here is the creed of Pope Pius. The perplexity belongs to it and its possessors. Mr. French knows that the Council of Trent has said the opinions of the fathers are "*various*" on the passage of John vi. referred to, and yet he says he will not interpret but according to "the *unanimous* consent of the fathers!" I say then that he is bound to shut his mouth on the sixth of John. His own Church, by the Council of Trent, declares there are "*various*" interpretations of the holy fathers, and yet he says he will not interpret without "the unanimous consent of the fathers;" and therefore I say, Mr. French's interpretation of the sixth of John is one of the most unwarrantable liberties he ever took in his life. [Laughter, and "Order."]

Let me go to the sixth of John. (and I am sorry I have only five minutes left to refer to it.) My opponent says, this chapter refers directly to the body and blood of

our Saviour in the Lord's supper, and proves Transubstantiation.

Now, in the first place, if it does so, why says our Lord, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing?" Our Lord says **THE FLESH** profiteth nothing—Mr. French says "**IT PROFITETH**" **EVERY THING**, and the whole matter is, whether the flesh or the Spirit profiteth. That is the point of discussion between me and my friend. The Bible says, "*the flesh profiteth nothing*;" the Church of Rome says *it profiteth so much* that you must believe it to be literally so, under pain of anathema. I ask, then, which am I to believe? The Church of Rome, which says the flesh profiteth every thing, or the Bible, which says "*it profiteth nothing*?" But my learned friend often makes mistakes, by leaving out the remainder of passages. What I wish Mr. French to do is, that the next time he quotes this text from the Bible he would read the words which follow,—"**the words that I speak unto you, THEY are SPIRIT and THEY are LIFE.**" Our Lord says, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing;" and again, "*the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*;" that is, the words that I speak unto you in the sixth chapter of John, which is an inspired report of my conversation, "**they are spirit, and they are life.**"

Again, our Lord asserts in this chapter, "**I am the bread of life**;" and mind you, if those words, "**this is my body**," are to be taken literally, why not carry the interpretation out through the sixth of John, and say, "**I am that bread**," means I am transubstantiated into that bread. "**I am that bread of life**" is just as strong as "**this is my body**." Why, are we not also to infer that his flesh became "bread,"

if, by a kindred form of expression, the bread became flesh? "Unless ye eat this flesh and drink this blood ye have no life;" *therefore* infants, as I have before stated, (if this chapter is descriptive of the Eucharist,) cannot be saved.

Again, our Lord says, "*whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.*" Then I presume that Luther, who came under the heavy anathemas of the Church of Rome, must, notwithstanding Mr. French's bad character of him, be saved, as he had eaten that flesh. I must also presume, that Judas must have been saved; that Cranmer, so much hated by the Church of Rome, must have been admitted to the same benefit. The assertion is, "*whosoever eateth*," and therefore Calvin, who, as my opponent observes, consented to the burning of Servetus at the stake, to the disgrace and discredit of his memory—an act which our reformed churches deplore and abhor—is also, though excommunicated, saved. In fact, if this chapter refers to the sacrament of the Eucharist, every wild and irreclaimable character, who has brought odium and contempt on the Christian name, but who gets access, *per fas aut nefas*, to the Eucharist, must, necessarily and eternally, be saved. [Sensation, and cries of "Order!"]

But our Lord explains his meaning very distinctly. "They said unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread!" Christ said unto them, "**I am the bread of life**; he that **COMETH** to me shall *never hunger*, he that **BELIEVETH** in me shall *never thirst*;" and again, "Every one which seeth the Son and **BELIEVETH** in him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." You observe, "eternal life" is attached to *faith* in Christ. Mr. French quotes, "**He**

that eateth this flesh has eternal life," as a proof of Transubstantiation; the Bible explains it, "he that believeth in me has everlasting life." Nay, more, the literal words are, "*whosoever eats this bread shall never hunger.*" Now, Mr. French says *literally, literally*. Then I ask Mr. French, has he hungered since he took the sacrament of the altar? If I am to pursue the literal interpretation, I must conclude that the participator shall literally *never* hunger; that he shall never thirst. Mr. French has actually impaled himself on the horns of many dilemmas, and he will prove himself to be a far greater controversialist than either the illustrious Bellarmine or the seraphic Aquinas, if he can extricate himself, or procure a safe and honourable deliverance.

This mode of illustrating divine truths was common with our Saviour. When he met the woman of Samaria, and said, "Give me water to drink," he turned the occurrence to a spiritual end, and added, "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give shall never thirst." Our Lord, as you know, made a similar use of the miracle at Capernaum, and drew, from the subject of the loaves and the fishes, a very beautiful discourse on believing in him; just as when he met the woman of Samaria, he turned the incident to a similar account. It is evident, from the passage, that eating his flesh is equivalent to believing, and describes the appropriation, by faith, of his wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, or becoming assimilated to him, and "made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." Again, we read, "Do this in remembrance of me." This denotes that Christ is absent. It implies that he is not *bodily* present,

and therefore no Transubstantiation. Again (1 Cor. xi. 23—26) the apostle says, "He took bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death *till he come.*" After consecration, you observe! it is written, "Whosoever shall eat this BREAD, and drink this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;" or, in other words, the apostle Paul calls it no less than FOUR times "BREAD and WINE," *after consecration*; but the Church of Rome says it is not "bread and wine," but "the body and blood, soul and divinity, bones and nerves, of the Son of God," the moment after consecration.

The next passage I adduce is Mark xiv. 23 :—"He took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it, and he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament." Now mark, Transubstantiation takes place when the words are pronounced, "this is my body," but here the wine is drunk *before* the transubstantiating accents are uttered, and therefore it must have been transubstantiated from wine to blood in their bodies, and not on the table. Such is the conclusion which it necessarily leads to: if the words, "this is my body, this is my blood," denote Transubstantiation, then this change necessarily, according to this text, took place in the stomach, and not on the altar. The language is strong; it cannot be otherwise.

As I have another minute, I will

call your attention to another passage, (1 Cor. xi. 26:)—“For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord’s death, *until he come.*” But, says the Church of Rome, *he is present* upon the altar, “body and blood, soul and divinity;” yet says the Word of God, “*until he come;*” the words plainly implying that he is *yet* to come, and that he is not yet bodily present. Lastly, 1 Cor. x. 17:—“We being many are *one bread;*” well, the Church of Rome, in the strict literality of her interpretation, must construe that, from these words, we are all *transubstantiated into bread*, and though your eyes tell you you are really flesh and blood, though *reason* tells you you are flesh and blood, though your *touch* tells you you are so, yet, if Transubstantiation be true, the whole Christian Church were all turned into a loaf, fairly transubstantiated into bread. My friends, the design of the Gospel is to raise man to the high dignity of God; but this system of Rome seems to bring down God below the corruption of man! [Long and continued sensation, and cries of “Order!”]

[Here the reverend gentleman’s hour terminated.]

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen, I am rather too careful, too parsimonious of my time—(having much solid matter to present to your minds)—to lavish it in dwelling upon those arguments, if arguments they can be called, upon which my learned friend has laid so much stress. I declare solemnly—and I am sorry to be obliged to say it in so pointed a manner—that I consider my rev. opponent to have frittered away, most idly and unprofitably to his cause, the greater part of the time limited to him by our mutual stipulation, in descanting

upon passages in sacred writ which he fondly imagines to be of similar force to that invincible text which I have repeatedly impressed upon you, namely, “*this is my body, this is my blood;*” a declaration made in the most solemn, testamentary manner by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when about to quit his disciples, before he left this sin-polluted world.

For my part, I can see no similitude whatever between the texts insisted upon by my adversary as being of similar operation, if the word *to be*, is to be taken literally, viz. “the seven ears of corn,” “the field is the world,” “the tares are the children of wickedness, the enemy that sowed them is the devil, the harvest is the end of the world, the angels are the reapers,” &c. &c. and a whole string more, occupying one or two pages. Upon reading them, and analyzing their meaning, no man can be under a momentary delusion as to their proper intended signification; but, after so many solemn, emphatic, and reiterated asseverations, as those which are used by our Lord and Saviour, in the sixth chapter of John, expounding to us plainly and unequivocally, the meaning of the sacrament which he was about to institute at the last supper, I cannot believe, I cannot make up my mind to believe, that our Saviour had anything in view of a less stupendous nature than to bequeath unto us the grand sacrament of the Catholic Church, namely, Transubstantiation,—the grand sacrament, I say, of that same Church that has transmitted the Bible to us; and without which Church you would not know what books were inspired and what apocryphal; yes, gentlemen, it cannot be too frequently repeated, that that same Church which has transmitted the Bible, transmitted to us,

at the same time, the glorious doctrine of Transubstantiation; and, when I open the pages of the said Bible, I find it most luminously staring me in the face, so as not by any possibility to be mistaken in its meaning. No; Christ, our blessed Saviour, was not such an idle squanderer of words, as Protestants would make him!

On the other hand, had the sacred evangelist occupied a whole chapter in repeating "*I am the door*," "*I am the vine*," and so on, in repeating it, I say, over and over again, with ever-increasing force, and earnestness of inculcation, so as to induce me to think for a moment that Christ meant not to allegorize, I candidly confess my senses would be bewildered; I should not know the meaning of his words: I should be totally at a loss to conjecture their possible application to any thing within the grasp of human intelligence. When our blessed Saviour says, "*I am the door*," "*I am the vine*," I understand the meaning now as I understood when I read it in my childhood; it is still at one glance, as it was then—too obvious to cause the hesitation of a moment as to its reference and intended analogy. To be short, it is a trivial argument pompously and verbosely insisted on by my learned antagonist, but by no means worthy of a grave and serious answer.

Let me, therefore, proceed to matter, in my humble opinion, much more worthy of our consideration. I shall first, however, before I come to enter upon it, endeavour to do away with the force of an objection urged against me by my learned friend as to my mode of interpreting Scripture, which, as he contends, is not to be allowed me, at least according to the creed of Pope Pius. I am not permitted, says my rev. antagonist, "to interpret otherwise

than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." Now, without the least dread of such a denunciation, or the least pause to consider its force and validity, I have said over and over again, that the fathers are all unanimous on Transubstantiation; that all, without one single exception, all unite, all vie with one another in expressing in the most clear, forcible, emphatic, energetic, unambiguous language, the grand tenet of Catholicity for which I am contending; and among these, none more powerfully, none more significantly, than the great St. Augustine, two extracts from whom my learned friend has read to you; and though, from his knowledge of the classics, he understands the words thoroughly, he does not seem to have penetrated into the meaning, the idea, to be conveyed by them. Indeed, I will venture to assert, and I hope to do it without giving offence, that my rev. opponent is not deeply conversant with the works of St. Austin. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I cannot but suspect, that he has not read him deeply, so as to be able to explain particular passages, by conferring them with innumerable others clearly explicative of their meaning.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I am quite satisfied with the passages I have read.

Mr. FRENCH.—Now all those passages I read to him, are perfectly authentic, and perfectly reconcilable with those passages quoted by my rev. opponent, so as to enable them conjointly to uphold our tenet; but the learned gentleman cannot twist and distort my passages by any ingenuity so as to render them assistant to his purpose. What St. Augustine constantly and repeatedly inculcates is, "that we ought not to eat the sacrament after the manner of the *Caphernaites*." His words I have already quoted, but he ever main-

tains, unbendingly, that it is "the real body and blood of our Lord."

Listen to his words:—"As we receive, with a faithful heart and mouth, the Mediator of God and man, Christ Jesus, who tells us that *his body is to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk*: although it may appear more horrible to eat the flesh of man than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to shed it."—*St. Aug. contr. Advert. Legis et Proph.* lib. ii. cap. 9, vol. viii. p. 599.

"For he spoke to us of his body and his blood: his body, he said, was food; his blood drink."—Vol. v. p. 640.

"Since they eat his very flesh, and drink his very blood."—Vol. v. p. 391.

When, therefore, St. Augustine alludes to figure in eating, he argues not against our belief, but against the Caphernaïtes; of whom he says, "As they understood flesh, not so do I give my flesh to eat."—Tom. ix. Tract 27.

"But how," continues he, "did they understand flesh?"

Listen again to his words:—"What, therefore, means that phrase, *the flesh profiteth nothing*? It profiteth nothing, in the manner in which they understood it; for they understood it to mean flesh as it is mangled in a dead body, or as it is sold in shambles, not as it is quickened by the animating spirit of life; non quo modo spiritu vegetatur."—Tract 27, vol. iii. p. 403.

Again, "Sicut illi intellexerunt carnem, non sic ego do ad manducandum carnem meum." "As they understood it, not so do I give my flesh to eat."—*St. Aug.* tom. ix. Tract 27 in *Joann.*

Again, "What means," says St. Augustine, "this expression of our Saviour—'Does this offend you?' It means," says the Saint, "Ye think that from this body which ye behold, I am about to make parts,

and to cut up my limbs, and to give them to you."—*St. Aug.* tom. v. in *Joann.* c. 6, p. 642.

In such sense only, and with reference to such distorters of the sacrament, would St. Augustine have Christ's words to be deemed figurative, alluding to the same Caphernaïtes, whom St. Cyril designates when he says—"They surmised that they were urged after the manner of wild beasts to eat man's raw flesh, and drink his gore blood."—*St. Cyril*, 4, in *Joann.* 322. Whereas, our blessed Saviour intended it far otherwise, viz. that he would be eaten in the likeness of bread and wine, which were figures of his operations in our souls. But to contend that his substantial and real presence should be excluded is most remote from St. Augustine's intention, and from the whole tenor of his writings. What more palpable and infallible proof can be given of St. Augustine's meaning, than in the citation which I have above presented to you from his works? where he says, "We receive with faithful heart and mouth, Jesus Christ, Man-Mediator between God and man, giving his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, *although it seems more horrible to eat the flesh of man than to kill, and to drink the blood of man than to shed it.*"

These are the words of St. Augustine. But now, my friends, I leave for a while the 6th John, which, in my humble conception, proves most clearly that he intended to give us "his body and his blood;" and I would ask my rev. friend whether our Saviour—supposing, for a moment, if my friend will concede the supposition—that our blessed Saviour meant in reality to give us "his body and his blood,"—will my learned friend have the candour to tell me, could he possibly have used

stronger words than those we find noted down by the evangelist, "this is my body, this is my blood?"

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Do you wish an answer now?

Mr. FRENCH.—Why really, gentlemen, I have but little time; I speak so slow, and my friend so rapidly, both in his expressions and quotations, that I must be very niggardly as to the abandonment of my time. [Laughter, and cries of "Order!"] But, my friends, leave we for awhile the 6th of John, to which I intend to return this evening, if I have time—that chapter in which the evangelist declares perpetually, in words, whose strength and significance increase in every sentence which he utters, that he meant to give us "his flesh to eat and his blood drink." Let us now listen to the language of one who came after him, and who is denominated by the evangelist—"the vessel of election," or, as the Protestant version has it, "the chosen vessel." What, then, says St. Paul, "the vessel of election," in elucidation of our subject? Before I cite his words, I think it proper to direct your attention to Acts ix. 6. It is in the relation of St. Paul's journey to Damascus, where, in ver. 4, it is said, "And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"

"6. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? and the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

Accordingly, as you all know, Paul repaired to Ananias.

Paul goes to Ananias, and, I suppose, learned from him the main body of the Christian tenets: but it is here most extraordinarily observable, that, although he had been thus instructed by Ananias, yet

upon the stupendous mystery of the Eucharist he was reserved to be instructed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself; although my rev. friend, I dare to say, will tell you, that after his ascension to heaven Christ never appeared upon the earth.

Now listen to the words of St. Paul:—"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death until he come."

Now, gentlemen, what I would ask is simply this: namely, what necessity was there of the least enlightenment from his divine Master, on a subject so plain, so simple, so totally unmysterious, as that of the Lord's supper in the acceptance of Protestants? Could not Ananias have been sufficient to teach him this? On the other hand, suppose it to be the Catholic sacrament, we can easily conceive, in that case, that our Saviour might have intended to announce and to enforce still more indissolubly, and to ratify still more solemnly the grand dogma, by communicating it by his own peculiar "vessel of election," who not only tells us that Christ *did* so, —mark, gentlemen, who not only tells us that Christ *did* so, but declares with an awful warning voice—that "whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of

the Lord;" and again, in another part, "for he that eateth or drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body.*" And here, exclaimed my rev. friend, in his concluding speech of the last evening, who discerns the Lord's body? Can the Papist discern it? can the Catholic discern it? I was astonished to hear this, because I gave the learned gentleman great credit for insight into the Greek and Latin languages. God forbid that I should be so envious as to detract from a fellow scholar! He is a man, polished in all the learning of antiquity, and you are witnesses how beautiful a displayer he is of all the elegances of his own language; but I was literally astonished that he should say, who can discern the body of our Lord; can the Papist, can the Catholic do it?—applying, as he did, the word "discern" to the eye, whereas we know in the original that it refers to the judgment of the *mind*, *not* to the corporeal eye; *διακρίνων* is the word, 1 Cor. xi. 29:—"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Not having sufficient discrimination of mind to apprehend the mystery; not having the sense, the discrimination to see, as I have told you over and over again, and as the evangelist has told you over and over again, that it is actually "the body of the Lord"—"not discerning," "*non dijudicans corpus Domini.*"

Now, I would ask, how are we "guilty of eating and drinking the body and blood of the Lord," if they be not there? Why this dreadful denunciation against the desecrators of mere bread and wine, in which there is not the remotest similitude to the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ? When,

therefore, our Saviour, and his evangelists, and apostles, and saints, whom he sent to convert all nations, teach me, with one unanimous and according voice, that the flesh and blood of our Saviour are veritably received in the sacrament of the Eucharist, who shall convince me, and my friends here present, that the whole of this ineffable mystery consists in eating and drinking a little bread and wine, reverentially in remembrance of his death and of his passion? If St. Paul meant to teach me, as my learned friend, forsooth, would teach me this evening, that it is but "bread and wine," by what invigoration of my faculties am I to "*discern*" the body of the Lord, where it neither exists nor is supposed to exist? But if I am to speak as a Catholic, looking at it steadfastly with the eye of celestial faith, not with that of mere terrestrial reason, I can just as easily believe in Transubstantiation as I can believe in the incarnation of Christ in the womb of the Virgin! Each of these two immortal tenets, viewed by the narrowness of human conception, staggers and confounds me; viewed by the calm, celestial eye of pondering faith, each of them commands most irresistibly my unqualified assent. I will not exclaim with the murmuring Jew, on the one hand, nor with the murmuring Protestant on the other, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink?" "this is a hard saying, who can hear it?" but I will simply ask, does this man, or rather, does this Man-God, say—repeating it over and over again—that he will give his body to eat, and his blood to drink? and I believe that he will give them. His solemn and emphatic words can no more deceive me than his power can deceive him by disappointing the *fiat* of his divinity.

The reality, therefore, of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist is most solidly established by the word of Christ himself; it is with equal solidity established by St. Paul, his "vessel of election;" it is with equal solidity established by the authoritative testimony of the Catholic church—the Catholic church, I say—that church which Christ has commanded all nations to obey, under pain of being considered as heathenmen or publicans, that is, destitute of eternal life, should they refuse obedience, and presume, in the pride of intellect, to instruct themselves. Yes, my friends, the dogma of Transubstantiation has been proclaimed aloud by this ever-speaking, never-changing, Catholic church, in every age and in every clime, from the days of the apostles down to the times in which we live; aye, my friends, in every country and in every clime, and in none more conspicuously than in the land we live in; and where the magnificent edifices of our Catholic ancestors still attest, by a sublimity and adaptation of things not to be misinterpreted, the sublime purposes for which they were originally destined. If I am asked, why attach a literal and not a figurative meaning to these words? my prompt answer is, because to interpret them figuratively would be acting in express contrariety to my blessed Saviour, who prohibits me so to do. Yes, our Saviour warns us by his answer to the Jews, not to entertain the least doubt on the subject. They (the Jews) asked, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" He said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless ye *eat the flesh* of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, ye have no life in you."

Here, then, in these plain words, I see an eternal *veto* upon all those fanciful excursions into the realms

of "orientalism," into which my learned friend this evening would willingly conduct us; here I see an indissoluble tie to bind me to the literality of the text; here I see an explicit, a direct injunction to proceed in interpreting his words by a straightforward way, not by remote and wandering circumvolution. The light which illuminates this mysterious *dogma* is the all-luminous word of Him who taught it; and, as to its credibility, I can just as readily believe "the body and blood," that is, Christ, whole and entire, to be on the altar after the words of consecration, as I can believe that the water was turned into wine at the marriage-feast of Cana. He who said, "Let light be," and "there was light," said also, "this *is* my body, this *is* my blood," and I maintain that it became his body and his blood instantaneously; and I maintain, moreover, that it will become so, so often as the words of consecration are pronounced by duly consecrated ordained priests in apostolical succession, until the end of time.

And here, my friends, having mentioned the necessity of regular apostolic succession in the priesthood, in order to be able to consecrate, permit me to remind you that there is in this country but one universally acknowledged priest, and that is the Catholic one. Reflect, my friends, if a Catholic priest turns Protestant, he is immediately admitted into your pulpits—his ordination is all right! On the other hand, should a Protestant clergyman turn Catholic—even should it be the Archbishop of Canterbury himself—we say to him, No, no, you are no priest. Before you officiate at our altars you must come and be ordained. Now I have only one word to observe in conclusion of this subject. I wish I were

gifted with the extemporaneous powers of my friend, but I have done my utmost to develop the sacred, the mysterious dogma, in which I so thoroughly believe, so that all the mountains of Protestantism in the world would never be able to move me, notwithstanding the fond anticipation of my learned friend, that I am not unlikely to become a Protestant. "Heaven and earth may pass away," but my firm hope and trust in Christ Jesus shall never fade—that I shall live and die in the bosom of the Catholic Church!

And now, my Protestant friends, for whose salvation I so ardently pant, as my learned friend tells me also he pants for mine, will you still continue to cry out, like the murmuring and incredulous Jews, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat and blood to drink?" Will you still shake your heads and say, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" and then "walk no more with him?" No, my friends, this night, I pray you, let the hollow murmurings of your stubborn unbelieving hearts cease to rebel within you; let them sink, I beseech you, into that calm, that blessed, that unruffled serenity of belief, which is to be found alone in the bosom of the Catholic church. But if my words and arguments be not sufficiently emphatic, gentlemen, to make some feeble impression on your breasts, let me entreat you to listen attentively whilst I read the words of an eloquent pastor of our Church, who wrote in the year 372. He is addressing himself to a pupil who was thoroughly persuaded of the great mystery, but who was too diffident of his own virtue to approach the sacred table. Thus writes St. Gregory Nazianzen, in the year—and notice the date—372!—"Nay, without shame, without hesitation, eat the body, drink

the blood, if thou art really thirsting after life; *neither incredulous as to the words concerning the flesh*, nor offended at those concerning the passion. Stand firmly propped, fixed, unwavering, not to be staggered in thy belief by the force of an antagonist, nor to be drawn asunder from it by any plausibility of speech. Stand upon the elevation thou hast seized; plant thy feet in the courts of Jerusalem, in order that thou mayest continue to move onward to thy God with a firm, untottering step."—*St. Greg. Naz. Bened. tom. i. p. 690.*

Now, gentlemen, I may boast of being truly eloquent with these words in my mouth, characterized as they are by genuine eloquence as well as genuine sanctity. They were delivered in the year 372, a little, methinks, before Pascasius Rhadbert wrote concerning Transubstantiation, who, if I believe my learned friend, lived in the ninth century—an obscure monk, of Corby, in Saxony. The first father of the Church who wrote concerning Transubstantiation I have quoted to you, viz. Ignatius Martyr; now the second is Justin Martyr, who flourished A.D. 150; he, too, knew as much, one would imagine, about pure, unadulterated Christianity, as my learned friend, who sits at my right hand side, and who has studied the Gospel so very deeply.

Now, in the important passage I am about to lay before you, he is writing to Antoninus, the Roman emperor, at the time that the Christians were persecuted and put to death for being Christians, and, among other groundless charges, "for eating human flesh," as the learned gentleman well knows, versed as he is in ecclesiastical history. In the first centuries of the Church, I say, my learned friend well knows that the cry against the

Christians was, that at their sacrifices they ate human flesh; he, therefore (Justin Martyr), writes an "Apology for the Christians," in which are to be found these ever-memorable words with reference to the Eucharist:—"And this food, with us, is called the Eucharist, of which no one is permitted to participate but *he who believes that the things which are taught by us are true*, and who has been washed in the laver of the remission of sins and of regeneration, and who leads a life conformable to the precepts of Christ. For we do not receive these as common bread, or as common wine, but in the same manner as, through the Word of God, Jesus Christ, having become incarnate, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; *just so likewise we have been taught*, that the food by which, through digestion, our flesh and blood are nourished, being made the Eucharist by the prayer of the Word of God, *is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus!*"

That is our doctrine, and no doctor of divinity, no Council of Trent, or any council in the world, could express the Catholic doctrine more circumstantially, more pithily than that. And now, as I flatter myself that I can write a little better than I can speak, I beg leave to read a few observations of mine, which are to be found in a work written some years ago upon this identical extract:—

The reader will perceive, that in the foregoing small cluster of authorities which I have gathered from the works of the Greek fathers, the last quotation which I have presented to his notice, had I consulted merely the order of time in which they respectively lived, should have been placed immediately after that of St. Ignatius, who flourished in the year of our Lord 68.

If it be asked, what reason has induced me in this single instance to deviate in so remarkable a manner from the regular succession of time in which these fathers respectively flourished, my answer is simply this. Of all the glorious testimonies corroborative and illustrative of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, every one of which is more than sufficient completely to overwhelm the antagonist of the Catholic, there is not one, from the very beginning to the end, so uncontrollable as an authority in every line, word, and syllable, as the passage in question. Yes, the very sight of the glittering page dazzles the eye of the beholder; it is instantaneously destructive to the whole cause of Protestantism. It is a passage, I contend—and I say it in the spirit of true charity—which the enemies of truth among men must behold with dismay, and the devil with abhorrence. There is not in it one ambiguous word capable of misleading the judgment of a calm, rational, and dispassionate inquirer. It is all clear and self-evident. No lawgiver, of the deepest insight into the depravity of human nature, and desirous of anticipating every species of quibble, chicanery, and evasion, could, in the profoundest reach of human wisdom, have penned a law so totally unsusceptible of misconstruction in all after ages, as is this exposition of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and, let me add, that it was given by one who shed his blood in the cause of its Divine Institutor, so early as the year 166.

Reflect then, most deeply, O sincere inquirer into primitive Christianity! thou, I say, who wouldst deem it a cause of far greater exultation to be foiled in argument, provided thou couldst but find out that inestimable jewel, Truth, than

to be applauded and crowned with all the garlands of genius by the associates of thy early wanderings! What is it that St. Justin says, and to whom is it that his words are addressed? Know, then, that he is writing to the Roman emperor, Antoninus Pius; and that, at the very time when he wrote it, a report was prevalent throughout the whole Roman empire, that the Christians in their sacrifices made it a part of their sacred rites to murder infants and to eat human flesh. The secrecy with which the awfully tremendous mysteries were veiled by the Christians in those early ages, accompanied with incautious words, sometimes uttered by true believers in the hearing of Pagans, as well as with confessions (sometimes extorted by the violence of racks and tortures,) that the Sacrament was the real body and the real blood of Jesus Christ, alone could and did give rise to the dissemination of so barbarous an opinion.

What a splendid opportunity had not St. Justin upon this occasion, had the doctrine of mere bread and wine been known at that early period, of allaying all the ferment that had been excited against the professors of Christianity, on the ground of their being mere cannibals! The way to proceed was plain and obvious. He had nothing to do but, with all the mildness of a Christian utterly averse to such a ferocious practice as that of eating human flesh, to acquaint the Roman emperor with the true circumstances of the case—to account for the origin of the report that had been spread against them—namely, by assuring him that, although the priest at the sacrifice said, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and that the people cried out "Amen!" yet that they meant it as a mere type or figure of the precious body

and blood—not as the reality. He had, I say, simply to state, had the Lord's Supper, in the Protestant acceptance, been then known, that the harmless rite consisted merely in eating bread and drinking wine, in remembrance of their blessed Master, without indulging one single thought of their being changed by the words of the blessing into real flesh and real blood; although, by a species of harmless *misnomer*, (according to the Protestant doctrine,) the custom was to call them by those respective names. This explanation would, methinks, have been amply sufficient; and had St. Justin thus given it, I do own that the Protestant might have had some plausibility of argument in declaiming against the doctrine of Transubstantiation as being empty and fallacious. But oh! if this was really the intent of the holy father in writing to a Pagan emperor upon this mystery of Christian faith, what language more mysterious in its import could he possibly have used as explanatory of the grand *arcanum*, than those words which are contained in the passage above quoted? How could the words, "*is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus,*" have been intended by St. Justin to convey to the Roman emperor the doctrine of Protestantism on this momentous subject?

The answer to this question, which in the eyes of a reader of a plain ordinary capacity seems to present difficulties of a most insurmountable nature, so far from causing the least alarm in the breast of Archbishop Tillotson, furnishes, on the contrary, in his grave opinion, a most resistless argument against us. Every line with him is strictly orthodox, and easy to be accommodated to plain Protestantism, without the slightest violence or distortion of phrase. There is only

one oversight in this the learned Archbishop's powerful attempt to overturn the ever-flourishing dogma of Christianity in question, of which his lordship appears to have been guilty—and that is, of not presenting to his Protestant reader the passage of St. Justin at full length, instead of the two or three *hors d'œuvre* expressions calculated to answer the purpose which he had in view. This, to be sure—and herein he perfectly coincides with all the divines of the Church of England since its foundation—would have been a very dangerous experiment. What, indeed, could all arguments have availed to those who have hitherto given up their understandings to be guided by the learning of such a divine as Tillotson, had he been candid enough to give in the same page which was graced with his sonorous periods against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as being repugnant to the doctrine of the fathers, merely one milesimal part of what those said fathers had delivered in testimony of its eternal truth? What would have become of the ductility of the scholar at Oxford and Cambridge for nearly three centuries past, had such a practice been unanimously adopted by their Professors of Theology? Why, the manifest result would have been most unquestionably to place in substitution upon those very shelves, where the fathers now repose in their libraries covered with the dust of ages that profusion of never-ending volumes which have issued from the British press every year since the days of the Reformation, for the express purpose of misrepresenting the doctrine contained in them. “Good God!” would the astonished pupil have exclaimed to his instructor, “is it possible that the fathers could have thus written, and that you could have thus taught?”

The next astounding objection of Archbishop Tillotson against Transubstantiation is as follows:—“There is,” says his lordship, “another remarkable testimony of Irenæus, which, though it be not now extant in those works of his which remain, yet has been preserved by Eusebius; and it is this: ‘*When (says he) the Greeks had taken some servants of the Christian Catechumeni (that is, such as had not been admitted to the Sacrament), and afterwards urged them by violence to tell them some of the secrets of the Christians, these servants, having nothing to say that might gratify those who offered violence to them, except only that they had heard from their masters that the divine communion was the blood and body of Christ; they, thinking that it was really blood and flesh, declared as much to those that questioned them. The Greeks taking this as if it were really done by the Christians, discovered it to others of the Greeks, who hereupon put Sanctus and Blandina to the torture, to make them confess it.*’ To whom Blandina boldly answered. ‘*How could they endure to do this who by way of exercise (or abstinence) do not eat that flesh which may lawfully be eaten?*’ “By which it appears,” says Archbishop Tillotson very gravely, “that this which they would have charged upon Christians, as if they had literally eaten the flesh and drank the blood of Christ in this Sacrament, was a false accusation which these martyrs denied, saying they were so far from that, that they, for their part, did not eat any flesh at all.”

Such, reader, is the very skilful refuge by which the learned Archbishop, in quoting this memorable extract from St. Irenæus, endeavours to evade the force of those pregnant words contained in it, namely, that they (the slaves) had heard from

their masters, that *the divine communion was the body and blood of Christ*. Now hear the answer, and let me obtain the command of your full attention whilst I give it. The question expected to be spoken to by Sanctus and Blandina, was whether they ate *human flesh*, of course according to a *human* mode of eating, namely, being sensible that it is flesh whilst one is eating it; and the answer of the martyrs was precisely that which a Catholic in the present century would be obliged to give to a torturer who should have the power of putting such a question—namely, that he *did not*; and moreover would he add, that he shuddered at such an action. St. Augustine, indeed, has rejected from the Catholic faith such a mode of eating, in describing that which the first Protestants, the carnal-minded Jews, who rose against the words of our Saviour, conceived that the meaning of his words tended to inculcate. “*Quid est ergo, Non prodest quidquam caro? Non prodest quidquam, sed quomodo illi intellexerunt, quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur, aut in macello venditur, non quomodo spiritu vegetatur.*”—Tract. 27, vol. iii. p. 503.

“What, therefore, means that phrase, *The flesh profiteth nothing?* It profiteth nothing in the manner in which they understood it; for they understood it to mean flesh as it is mangled in a dead body, or as it is sold in the market, *not as it is quickened by the animating spirit of life.*”

Now is it not precisely in this manner that they (the Greeks) conceived the Christians to eat human flesh? And was not the answer of Sanctus and Blandina, with the utmost accuracy, correspondent to the intention of those who put the question, as to the mode in which it was to be answered, viz. *Yes*, or *No*, as to the carnality of the eating?

But neither did St. Irenæus nor St. Augustine mean to inculcate that the flesh and blood of our Saviour was not to be really eaten and drunk in the sacramental manner in which they are received by the Catholic: to prove which look to the words of St. Irenæus, cited above, and attend to the following passage from St. Augustine:—

Conversi sunt ex ipso populo Judæorum, conversi sunt et baptizati sunt; ad mensam Domini accesserunt, et sanguinem quem sævientes fuderunt, credentes biberunt.”

They [some of the Jews,] were converted; they were converted and baptized; they approached to the table of the Lord; and now, *believing, they drank that blood which in their ungovernable fury they themselves had shed.*”

The answer, therefore, of those blessed martyrs,—to express myself by this passage of the same St. Augustine,—was given to men who, in regard to the question, “*spiritualia carnaliter sapiebant*” (vol. iii. par. 2.) had ever conceived of spiritual things in a manner wholly gross and temporal, and the answer was, therefore, precisely that which ought to have been given.

And here let me ask, Had the learned Archbishop, in bringing forth this passage of St. Irenæus, had nothing else in view but to discharge a duty to his conscience, and to his God, by explaining the real doctrine of primitive Christianity on this contested point, would it not have been natural for him to observe, that Ecumenius, instead of drawing the same inference with himself (the Archbishop) from the extract which he gives from Irenæus, actually declares himself *a true Papist*, when, in his own words, he attempts to elucidate the same subject? Explaining the meaning of those words of St. Paul, “He that eateth and

drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body," (Ecumenius says—

Μη διακρινων τουτεστι μη εξεταζων, μηδε εννοων των προκειμενων το μεγαθος. Ει γαρ μαθοιμεν, τις ποτε εστιν ο προκειμενος, ου δεηθησομεθα ετερου, αλλ' αυτα ινυτο ημας νηφειν παρασκευασει.—*Ecum.* Ed. Morel. Paris, 1631, fol. vol. i. p. 523. "Not discerning: that is, not accurately inquiring into, nor sensible of, the grandeur of the things that lie before us. For, did we but learn *who it is that is there*, never should we be in want of any other incitement; this alone would be sufficient to impress awe upon our minds, and regulate our behaviour."

Τι γαρ εστι φησιν ο αρτος; δηλονοτι το σωμα Χριστου.—*Ibid.* "For what is," says he, "the bread? Why, it is the body of Christ."

Is it possible, therefore, let me ask of any impartial Christian, that Ecumenius, who has thus expressed himself, could have preserved this glorious extract from St. Irenæus with the intention of wresting it into evidence, as Archbishop Tillotson has endeavoured to do, against the doctrine of Transubstantiation? Would *he* not, too, had he thought like the Protestant archbishop, have seized with avidity this very opportune occasion, of stigmatizing, with vehemence equal to that of his lordship, the doctrine which we Catholics profess, and at the same time of developing that which is upheld by the Church of England?

But the most astonishing instance of the Archbishop's want of candour in making extracts from some few fathers of the Church is exhibited in those passages which he has culled from the great St. Augustine. Whoever has the slightest tincture of acquaintance with the works of this holy father cannot but observe how

very unsuitable his language is, upon all occasions, whenever he touches upon the sacrament of the Eucharist, to that mode of interpretation in which the same subject is treated by Protestants. Tillotson, however, instead of exerting the vigour of his genius to disentangle the Protestant from those embarrassments in which innumerable passages from the works of St. Augustine must of necessity involve him, has the art, and at the same time the imprudence, to repose the whole strength of his cause upon some detached sentences and loose unconnected expressions of that father, the meaning of which he evidently shows that he does not, or rather that he will not understand.

The whole tendency of the passages in question goes to show that the flesh and blood of Christ are really received in the sacrament. St. Augustine inculcates over and over again, that although Christ's body, according to the supposition of its being eaten in a carnal and temporal manner, like other common meats, *profiteth nothing*; yet, eaten in a spiritual and sacramental manner, in opposition to the gross dwelling of mere flesh and blood, is the source of life and sanctification to the soul. He affirms again and again, that his words concerning his flesh are not mere draughts of fiction; but that he is present in the reality, in the substantiality, though not after a visible, corporeal, or carnal manner.

This is the truly Catholic doctrine which St. Augustine, with incessant industry, in almost every page, inculcates. "Ye are not," he makes Christ himself to say, interpreting his words, "to eat this body as ye now see it; but this same body, being in a spiritual and invisible manner in the Sacrament, ye are to eat, or ye have no life in you."

Before I conclude, I must not omit to say that I had an answer to give, if I had time, as to the *cup* or *chalice*, upon which my learned friend has so ingeniously and so sophistically argued. St. Luke xxii. 17:—"And he took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves:" (xxii. 18.) "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Now, this chalice, according to the very evidence of the text itself, is not the second part of the holy Sacrament, but that solemn cup of wine which belonged as a libation to the offering and eating of the Paschal Lamb, and which, being an especial figure of the *holy chalice*, *was there* drunk of by our Saviour and given to the apostles, with the declaration that it should not be drank of any more until it should be drank anew in the kingdom of God; that is to say, in the celebration of the blessed Sacrament of his blood of the New Testament. And by this place it seems to be confirmed that the words in St. Matthew, xxvi. 29—"I will not drink of the fruit of the vine," &c. had reference to this cup of the old law, although they are here, by repetition or recapitulation, spoken after the holy chalice. At all events, whatever may be the allusion, I am sure my rev. opponent is not inclined to maintain seriously that mere wine, new or old, is drunk in the kingdom of heaven.

But to quit this subject. The grand *onus*, after all, that sits so heavily on the shoulders of my learned friend, is to explain away all antiquity, and to tell us how the doctrine of Transubstantiation could possibly have sprung up in the world at any period subsequent to the apostles; how it is that all the fathers of the Church should have been themselves deceived, or should

have thus unanimously struggled by their tongues to deceive others; how it is that the Greek Church, who separated from us so many centuries ago, and the Nestorians and Eutychians, who separated from us in the fourth or fifth century, still with one accordant voice maintain the doctrine of Transubstantiation. I should like to hear the learned gentleman for a whole week together, if he would but attempt to give a satisfactory answer to these entanglements. Why, even on the supposition that we could not prove it from this argument; if the books of the New Testament had been irrecoverably lost, as some of them most incontestably have been; were it so fully proved in Scripture, still would I abide by the uninterrupted doctrine of ages, and just as firmly and truly believe that doctrine as I believe by tradition that the city of Rome is placed on the very spot where it formerly was, at least as to some part of its building, which plainly shows its antiquity.

Gentlemen, I have finished; I am satisfied with my exertions, though I am not satisfied with my feeble efforts as of consequence when compared with the splendid effusions, the metaphorical flourishes of my rev. opponent.

[The learned gentleman's hour having elapsed, John Kendal, Esq. the chairman on the part of the Catholics, arose to announce that, on the following Tuesday, a fresh subject would come under discussion, namely, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that Mr. French would make the first speech on that occasion.]

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

REV. J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH, Esq.

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter

THIRD EVENING, TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1839.

SUBJECT:

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen, I rise once more with alacrity to enter that *arena* into which I have been invited by my learned and talented opponent; and I must say, that I rise on this occasion equally pleased with the retrospect of my past exertions in this glorious cause, as with my anticipations of those which I am about to make this evening, with the assistance of Almighty God, which I have most fervently implored,—I say, which I am about to make this evening, in tracing the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, directly, from age to age, up to the very times of the apostles. Nay, I intend to do more; whatever surprise it may excite in my learned friend, I intend to prove that the Sacrifice of the Mass is pointed out specifically in the *New Testament* itself. Yes, gentlemen, I once more raise my voice in this assembly to combat my opponent, as a fondly attached son of my Mother Church—to combat for that Church, which alone is covered with the hoar of ages, amidst the innumerable churches that, in this land of fickleness and inconstancy, are perpetually rising around her, all envying her, and vainly claiming her unparticipated honours. But know, ladies and gentlemen, these honours cling to her inseparably, and are not to be wrung from her either by violence or by fraud. The Catholic Church, as we have seen, has been heard, in every age since the time of the apostles; and, as I shall prove to you demonstrably this evening—in every age by a duly ordained and

consecrated priesthood, descending in one continued stream of succession from the days of the apostles; in every age, I say, by such a priesthood, has the Sacrifice of the Mass been offered up in her majestic temples.

If, on the other hand, my friend say the Sacrifice of the Mass, which I am advocating, be, as my learned friend will no doubt contend this evening, if it be but an error and corruption of Christianity, and not of apostolic origin, I then must impose on the shoulders of my learned friend a burden that will be great indeed; I must call upon him, in that case, and I shall reiterate the calling until I have a satisfactory reply—I shall call upon him to point out in what age the Sacrifice of the Mass *did* arise; I shall request him, by historical *data*, and not by wild conjectures, to specify some given period, and I will allow him much latitude in this investigation. If he chooses, he may take any given compass within fifty years; if that be not sufficient, I will give him a century; if he is discontented with that, I will give him any two centuries, or any three centuries, within the compass of which he will most indubitably be enabled to tell us, with something like precision, when it was that this imposition was first practised upon the Christian world. When, I say, did this sudden, simultaneous act, mar and alter the whole system of primitive belief over all Christendom? which *primitive belief* we will suppose, for the sake of argument, however unlikely

it may be, we will suppose to have been the belief of Calvin. How, then, I say, on such a supposition, was the Sacrifice of the Mass introduced into the world? How, let the learned gentleman tell me, was it finally established? Was there no controversy when it planted its first foot, if I may use the expression? Was there no man of common education—no man, who, like my learned friend himself, loathing the very shadow of such an institute, was ready to dispute the contested point, and to declaim, with all the vehemence with which the learned gentleman will thunder this evening, against the Sacrifice of the Mass? Was there no Calvinist at his post when that “abominable superstition,” as it is called in Protestant books, suddenly burst in upon the world, or gradually crept into it? Was its progress through Christendom unopposed, because it was unperceived? or was it unobstructed, because it was unblamed, or, if you please, because it was encouraged and applauded?

What ingenious hypothesis of my learned antagonist, indulging in all the luxuriance of his “orientalism,” giving the loose reins to all the inventive powers of his genius, will be able to account, either for the sudden irruption of this Sacrifice of the Mass into the Christian Church, or for the slow, gradual, silent, undermining pace with which it gained ground, amidst the nations of the earth, disfiguring, on all sides, the pure fabric, the *Calvinistic* fabric, of original Christianity? taking it for granted, for the sake of argument I mean, that the primitive religion was the Calvinistic creed. When, I ask, and I call upon my learned friend to answer, when were the first Catholic altars erected—when were the loud symphonious hosannas of the Catholic Mass first resounded

in any country of the Christian world? Again, I ask, how will he account for the harmonizing bond of sympathy that exists between the Catholics of the Western part of the world and the Eutychians and Nestorians—between the Catholics of the Western part of the world and the remote Eutychians and Nestorians in the East—those schismatical churches who sundered from the Roman see fourteen hundred years ago, and have never been on the least terms of relationship with it since that moment—I ask, and it is a thundering and an appalling question for my learned friend, I confess, which I hope he will answer systematically this evening—I ask, what bond of sympathy, let him tell me, not by conjecture, but by proof, was ever known to exist between them that could induce them to coalesce, and to unite with emulating loudness of voice, in crying out to the nations of the world, “We received the Sacrifice of the Mass and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, by transmission, from apostolic days?”

My learned friend, during the course of his eloquent address the other evening, made frequent allusion, in his metaphorical flights, to the nature of a stream, and, if I recollect rightly, he characterized that pure and that pellucid stream, which, upon the subject of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, runs so equally through all the pages of the fathers, as a muddy stream; but the mud, in my humble opinion on such a subject, is merely in the learned gentleman’s own confused imagination. As far as I am able to understand the fathers, there is a most perfect consistency, a most unvarying assertion in every one of them, from beginning to end, as to the “body and blood” of our Lord being in the sacrament of

the Catholic Eucharist; and I will defy him, turning over all the pages, the voluminous pages of the fathers, to show me where there is a negative to the assertion of the Catholic Catechism, that it is really the body and the blood of our blessed Saviour.

There are many figurative expressions used, I grant, in Catholic writers; nay, we use figurative expressions even in our Mass: we call it the "*panem celestem*," and "*calicem salutis æternæ*," the celestial bread, &c., just as the rod of Moses, after it became a serpent, was still called a rod, and as the woman, after having been created, was still called the rib of Adam. So that there are figurative expressions we never deny; but what I contend is, that every father, both Greek and Roman, has always asserted, most strenuously and most harmoniously, that "the body and blood of Christ are *verily* received in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and that he who receives it not cannot inherit eternal life." The learned gentleman would in vain look for such an inconsistency in our liturgies, as that which is to be found in the English Protestant Liturgy. What can be—I put it to yourselves, as men of common sense—what can be more incoherent than that which I read in your Common Prayer-book, namely, that "*the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received by the faithful in the Sacrament*," whilst it is maintained by Protestants, most clamorously, that they are *not* there? But I was going to ask the learned gentleman, is a stream less likely to be limpid and incorrupt in proportion to its proximity to the fountain-head, than one which is wandering from it at an immeasurable distance of time and space? The purport of my metaphorical allusion, thus founded on his own, is simply this

—If the doctrines of primitive antiquity are to be attested in this our mutual endeavour after truth, is that attestation, I ask, in the name of equity and fairness of argument, to be sought for in the records of the *sixteenth century*? If you are of opinion, my friends, or if my reverend friend should be of opinion, that to know the doctrines of primitive antiquity, we ought with more propriety to recur to the writers of the sixteenth century, than to the writers of earlier ages, it must certainly be, in their estimation, an idle waste of words, on my part, to endeavour to trace back, as I shall do most lucidly, this evening, the Sacrifice of the Mass to the very days of the apostles.

In furtherance of this object, gentlemen, let me once more remind my reverend opponent, that I expect, before the conclusion of this discussion, he will condescend to give me the answer which I have so frequently solicited in our former discussions,—that is, to account, satisfactorily, for this wonderful harmony and consent existing between the Nestorians and the Eutychians, and the Catholics of the world, as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, and also as to the Sacrifice of the Mass. Their liturgies are in existence; we have them here, and I shall open them before you, and read to you respective parts relating to that sacred, that ineffably sacred doctrine, the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist?

When was it, I ask, therefore—for these questions have never been answered by any of your Protestant theologians, though so many have endeavoured to extricate themselves out of the entanglement by conjectural hypothesis—when was it, I ask, that *all the Calvinists in the*

world—for you are to suppress laughter, and to take it for granted that theirs was the primitive faith)—when was it that they all went to bed, on one dark night, all orthodox, all of sound belief—all sound Calvinists—and awoke—oh, wonder of wonders! on the following morning, without even the warning notice of a dream as to the coming, the impending evil—awoke, I say, on the following morning, all rank Papists, all prostrate at the feet of crucifixes and altars, all listening with solemn and profound devotion to the celebration of the Mass. Surely my reverend friend, when he is rising to harangue us to-night, cannot, he cannot surely refrain, out of common pity and humanity to his poor benighted Roman Catholic brethren—he cannot refrain from throwing some faint light, at least, upon the dark involutions of this wondrous, this mysterious tale! The difficulty, I must tell my reverend friend before-hand—for I have been disappointed before whenever I have asked the question—the difficulty must not be eluded by him this evening, by any ingenious subtlety, nor shrunk from by any pusillanimity. My reverend friend told us, the other evening, in rather boastful language, that he was “an undaunted son of Scotia,” that he was not to be intimidated, that he was not to be appalled by any difficulty or danger in the polemical field; he seemed to exclaim—if I may use a classical allusion familiar to the ears of my learned and reverend opponent:—“*Talibus viris non labor ullus insolitus, non locus ullus asper aut arduus; non armatus hostis formidolosus.*”—*Sallust.*

Such, I say, seemed, virtually, to be the exclamation of my learned antagonist—the plain English of which is, paraphrastically at least, no danger in the polemical field, no

difficulty whatever can throw me into a moment's consternation, or deter me from giving a plain, instantaneous, unequivocal reply! Well, then, I say, since my reverend opponent is so bold, so courageous, so daring a polemic, I have now proposed to him a difficulty which will require his utmost strength, and agility, and dexterity, to surmount. But alas! my friends, I am afraid you will be disappointed—I am afraid that it will meet with the same result which the same question met with on the last occasion that I put it: namely, that it will either be passed over in total silence, or that it will be referred to one of those convenient “dark ages” for an extrication from the entanglement—which are the usual resorts of our Protestant antagonists. Yes, my friends, that it will be referred to that convenient cover and place of exile for almost every event which puzzles the investigation of Protestants, when they are asked to give a satisfactory answer to the Catholic *as to the first appearance of the Eucharist or the Mass*, which we contend to be as old as Christianity itself.

Now, my friends, I must inform you that the uniform answer we receive from our theological antagonists, either in places of public discussion or in private conversation, is uniformly, “Oh! it must have sprung up in some of the dark ages; I am not obliged to point out when it sprang up, but most undoubtedly it was in one of those dark ages that both the Sacrifice of the Mass and the doctrine of Transubstantiation dated their origin.” And here, before I come to illustrate and explain what we mean by the Sacrifice of the Mass, I shall beg leave to use one argument, in corroboration of the perpetuity of this Sacrifice since the days of the apos-

tles, which I know will not be admitted by my Calvinistic friend, but which we always insist upon to be one of the most incontrovertible arguments—we always, as Catholics, and most unanswerably, as we contend, appeal to the voice of the Church of God, which must be granted to be our Church, until the existence in every age of some other Church agreeing with Calvinism or Luther be proved—and I am sorry that we began this discussion by first taking Transubstantiation, and then going to the Mass. It appears to me that we, both of us, have committed an error, in not taking the Rule of Faith first, for I should there have proved to you, most unequivocally, that there *is* a Church—founded by Christ—which Church all Christians are bound to obey, and that that Church can be no other but the Catholic church, because no other Church has records to show of its existence in all ages. All the churches now in existence, not excepting that of Calvin, the sainted instructor of my reverend friend, every one of them sprang up, as you well know, at the period of the Reformation, each of them maintaining that theirs is the real *Catholic* Church. But the great pity is, that they can give no proof to the world of their being Catholic, or persuade others to think them *Catholic*, much less to call them *Catholic*; though they say every day of their lives, “I believe in the holy *Catholic* Church.” But the Catholic church has this advantage over them all: it is called Catholic by its friends as well as by its enemies; and the consequence is, there is but one Catholic church, speaking one language, in all ages; that is, holding one uniform system of tenets, and inculcating those tenets regularly and faithfully; and in the front of them all, gloriously illumined, is the doc-

trine of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

And here I hope my learned friend will excuse me, if, in the course of this argument, I enliven this our dry discussion by reading a few verses, which I think extremely appropriate to the subject in hand; at all events, it will give me a greater facility in conveying my meaning to you in the future progress of this argumentation. I expect, as usual, some little sallies of my learned friend's wit for indulging in this excursion, and wandering into the realms of poetry; but, though the poetry be colloquial, the thoughts are condensed with such solidity in the few lines I am about to submit to him, that I think he will find in them copious matter to meditate upon, as well as to reply to. It is a little tract that I wrote about a year ago, to point out, as it were by the finger, the *Catholic* Church. Addressing Protestants, it says:—

“ Built by its founder on a lofty hill,
The Church ca'll'd Catholic is call'd so still;
The Church by which all nations were baptiz'd,

Which none who sought eternal life despised;
The Church in vain the gates of hell assail,
Based on a tow'ring rock, not lowly vale,
That every nation might th' eye uplift,
And recognise on high th' eternal gift.
Say, Protestants, if this the Church ye hold,
What sacred archives have your deeds enroll'd?

Who were your heads in each successive age,
What book can show the long-recording page,
Or what tradition, if your books should fail,
Is found to prop your legendary tale?
Where was your Church when first the Mass began?

Why hurl'd she not her thunders at the man
Whose tongue first broach'd that daring innovation,

Still call'd by Catholics *Transubstantiation*?
If ye the Church when that hard tenet rose,
Why fail'd her guardians to ward off her foes?

Dwelt in your Church the *Spirit of all Truth*,
When that old dogma was in days of youth?
Could no librarian in your Church be found
To stigmatize th' inflictors of the wound,—

No priest, no layman, in the Christian veal,
To check the spreading sore, or none to heal?
Could no pure Christian in the world appear,

To shed o'er dying truth one farewell tear?

View next those glorious *Liturgies* of old,
Read what those ancient monuments unfold;
What the Priest taught, what nations under-
stood,

Was it the real body and the blood,
Or was the consecrated bread and wine
A shadowy type and unsubstantial sign?
Alas! all teach alike, Christ Jesus whole,
The Flesh, the Blood, Divinity and Soul!
Th' Eutychians still, and the Nestorians

thrive,
And flourish in the East a numerous hive;
In the fifth century, as all agree,
These dropp'd off, sunder'd from the parent

tree;
No more than you our hallow'd Church they
bless.

Yet Transubstantiation all confess;
All cry aloud to those who dare oppose,
In no dark age the sacred tenet rose;
It was no tenet gradually creeping
Into the Church when all mankind were
sleeping;

It sprang up, then, when all th' apostles
shared

What Christ *his body and his blood* declared."

I have entered into the regions of poetry on this occasion, my friends, for no other purpose than that of placing before you, in very concise and pithy language, very momentous matter—matter which would take many diffuse sentences in prose to express clearly; whereas, here you have it impressed upon your memories, in a very compact mode, by the help of a few rhymes, which I hope will long tingle in your ears. Another advantage is, that it will sink more deeply into the mind of the learned gentleman, so that he will be able to grapple with me in a firmer manner.

But before I enter on the Sacrifice of the Mass, that is, to explain to you what it is, it may not be unseasonable to mention that the whole Greek schismatic Church, which separated from us in the year 890, as well as the numerous Greek Catholics in existence, and who perform the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Greek language, likewise agree, with all Roman Catholics in the universe, in declaring that they received the sacred dogma from the hands of the apostles. The word *Mass*, according to our Catholic

interpretation, means the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, offered up to God on our holy altars, in an unbloody manner, by the hands of the priest; or what amounts to the same thing, "an external oblation, made to God, of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and of wine." Now, my friends, it is manifest by the most ancient records of Christianity, by the unanswerable and undeniable testimony of the fathers, ever since the times of the apostles, by the ancient liturgies of all nations, Latins, Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, Armenians, Ethiopians, and Copts, and even by the confession of Protestants themselves, for which I refer you to the learned Dr. Field, (book iii. chap. 19,) it is affirmed by all these that the holy Eucharist always has been used in the Church of God, not only as a Sacrament, but also as a Sacrifice, instituted by Christ at his last Supper, for proof of which from the ancient Greek and Latin fathers I refer my respected friend to the ancient Greek and Latin fathers, St. Justin and St. Irenæus, of the second age. St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, speaking of the words of the prophet Malachi, refer them to this service; and one of the most remarkable proofs of the doctrine of the Mass is, that almost all the fathers of the Church appeal to the very same text of the ancient Bible to prove that grand sacrifice which constitutes the pride and consolation of the Catholic:—the words of the prophet are, "*From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place sacrifice shall be offered unto my name and a clean oblation;*" and, for further proof of it, they allude to these words of the Psalmist:—"Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchi-

sedec." Psalm ix. 4. It is quoted by St. Cyprian, in the third age; by St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius, and St. Augustine in the fourth; by St. Isidore, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, in the fifth. All these have quoted the very same passage in proof of the Sacrifice of the Mass, or, as they argue, "the priest, according to the order of Aaron, sacrificed beasts; but the Sacrifice of Melchisedeck was bread and wine, as we see by referring to Genesis iv. 18. St. Cyprian calls the blessed Eucharist "a free and full sacrifice." St. Cyprian, as you well know, lived in the third century. St. Augustine calls it "a free and sovereign sacrifice."—*De Civit. Dei*, book x. chap. 20. Eusebius calls it "an expiation." St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "a spiritual sacrifice, an *unbloody* worship, a propitiatory sacrifice," in his *Mystic Catechism*, chap. x. But there needs no other proof to substantiate this but what the Church of England itself teaches; for if "the body and blood of Christ be *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful," and consecrated by the priest, it must necessarily follow that they offer them up *verily and indeed* on the altar, and that they are an oblation of mercy; or how can Christ be acceptable to his Father, or how can the virtues of his passion be applied more effectually than in his own very Self. My learned friend will, no doubt, insinuate, after the Protestant fashion, that the Mass was an invention of after ages; but, my Protestant brethren, I am sure you will agree with me, that scarcely one of you ever suspected that we could prove, by authentic records, that 1,400 years ago it went under the same appellation as it does now—namely, the sacrifice of the Mass. St. Ambrose, in the fourth century, writes thus:—"I

continued to discharge my duty and began to say Mass."—*Lib. ii. epist. 14. Classes, t. xi. p. 853.*

In the year of our Lord 440, (the words are very remarkable,) St. Leo says:—

"In order that the discipline of our churches may in all things agree, this should be observed—that when a more solemn feast calls the people together, and more assemble together than the church can contain, *the offering of the sacrifice* ought to be repeated, lest any be deprived of it; for both religion and reason demand that the sacrifice should be so often repeated as there are people to partake; otherwise, if the custom of *one Mass* be followed, they who cannot find place must be deprived of the sacrifice. We, therefore, anxiously exhort you, that you do not neglect, but join with us as in faith, so in practice, to observe a rule *that by tradition has come down to us.*"—St. Leo, Ep. ii. 71, *ad Dioc. Alex.* p. 437. Parisiis, 1675.

Here, then, we have the Sacrifice of the Eucharist plainly spoken of, first, by St. Ambrose in the fourth century, and, secondly, by St. Leo, who lived in the fifth. But we must mount a little higher than St. Ambrose and St. Leo in our investigations, for we Catholics are not content with the testimony of the fourth century: we can go much higher. First of all, we will mount to the year 254, and hear from Pope Cornelius, another account, written in the year 256, who remarks, that, "on account of the persecution of the Christians, they could not publicly *celebrate Mass.*"—*Concil. Gener. t. i. p. 576.*

The words are, *neque agere missas licet*, which is good Latin for saying Mass to this day.

And now, my friends, we must mount up a little higher still, in

order to shackle the tongue of my reverend opponent in his invectives against at least the antiquity, however he may call in question the validity of the Sacrifice of the Mass. We go to Pope Pius I. Now this is worthy of all your attention. I am sure my learned friend has his pen in hand to be ready to note down the memorable words as they flow from my lips. Pius I. thus speaks, anno Domini 166 :—

“Our sister Euprepia, as you well recollect, made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate Mass.”—*Concil. Generale*, tom. i. p. 576. Edit. Labe. 576. Now, gentlemen, what argument my learned friend can bring against the antiquity of the Mass, as far as records go to substantiate it, I know not. There is only one strong logical argument against it that I can supply him with, and it is that we have in our statute books, a little more than a century ago, that it was “high treason to celebrate Mass in these realms.” That is certainly a very parliamentary argument against its antiquity, and I hope that the learned gentleman, in turning over his voluminous knowledge, will suggest something in the way of argument a little more solid and convincing in a reasoning age than to refer the antiquity of the Sacrifice of the Mass to the mere decision or denouncement of the legislature. Gentlemen, I wish to avail myself of the short time that still remains to me, by expatiating a little upon *the ancient liturgies*. The ancient liturgies that are come down to us are the most authentic monuments of antiquity furnished by ecclesiastical history. It is not for me, as a Catholic, to endeavour to impress this upon your minds, because coming from a Catholic, the testimony may appear either more or less suspicious. I shall,

therefore, beg to show you the nature of these liturgies, from which I shall read rather copiously when I have a little more time. I shall beg to show you the nature of them from the mouth of a Protestant archbishop.

“As for the liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James,” says Dr. Wake, a Protestant archbishop, “there is not, I suppose, any learned man who believes them written by those holy men, and set forth in the manner they are now published. They were, indeed, the ancient liturgies of the three, if not of the four Patriarchal churches, viz. the Roman (perhaps that of Antioch too), the Alexandrian and Jerusalem churches, first founded, or at least governed by St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James. However, since it can hardly be doubted but that these holy apostles and evangelists did give some directions for the administration of the blessed Eucharist in those Churches, it may reasonably be presumed that some of those orders are still remaining in those liturgies, which have been brought down to us under their names, and that, (mark, my Protestant friends, most attentively the following words,) *and that those prayers, wherein they all agree, in sense at least, if not in words, were first prescribed in the same or like terms by those apostles and evangelists.*”—*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 102.

Again, listen, my Protestant friends, to your celebrated Bishop Bull. “I add,” says he, “to what has already been observed, *the consent of all the Christian churches in the world, however distant from each other, in the holy Eucharist or Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same*

sense, order and method; which, whoever attentively considers, must be convinced that this order of prayer was delivered to the several churches in the world, in the very first plantation and settlement of them.—Sermons on Common Prayer. Sermon 13, vol. i.

Now it will be for me to prove that, amidst these innumerable liturgies, they all agree as to the substantiality of the words used. First, the Liturgy of St. James, the apostle; these were the words of the priest at the beginning of the Mass:—

From the Liturgy of St. James.
Renaudot, tom. ii.

“*Priest*. O God the Father, who, through thy great and ineffable love for men, didst send thy Son into the world, to bring back the wandering sheep, turn not away thy face from us, whilst we celebrate this spiritual and *unbloody sacrifice*.”—Page 30.

“*Priest*. This is my body, which is broken, and given for you and for many, for the remission of sins and eternal life. . . . This is my blood of the New Testament, which is poured forth for you, and for many faithful, and is given for the remission of sins and eternal life. . . . We offer to thee this tremendous and *unbloody sacrifice*, that thou mayest not deal with us, O Lord, according to our sins, nor repay us according to our iniquities; but according to thy mercy, and thy great and ineffable love for men, mayest efface our sins, the sins of thy servants offering their supplications to thee.”—Page 32.

“*Priest*. And may make what is mixed in this chalice, the blood of the New Testament, the saving blood, the life-giving blood, the heavenly blood, the blood giving health to souls and bodies, the blood of our

Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ; for the remission of sins and eternal life to those who receive it.”—*People*. “Amen.”—Page 33.

“*Priest*. Wherefore we offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and *unbloody sacrifice*, for thy holy places, which thou hast enlightened by the manifestation of Christ, thy Son,” &c.—Page 34.

The Deacon shall say, “Grant thy blessing, O Lord. Again, and again, through this *holy oblation* and *propitiatory sacrifice*, which is offered to God the Father, is sanctified, completed, and perfected, by the descent of the Holy Ghost, . . . we earnestly pray,” &c.—Pages 38, 39.

From the Liturgy of St. Mark.
Renaudot, tom. i.

“*Priest*. We offer to thee this rational and *unbloody* worship, which all nations, from the rising to the setting sun, from the north to the south, offer to thee: because thy name is great in all nations; and, in every place, incense is offered to thy holy name, and *sacrifice*, and oblation.”—Page 145.

“*People*. Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord.”

The Priest signs the holy mysteries with the sign of the cross, saying: “Truly heaven and earth are full of thy glory, by the manifestation of our Lord and God, and Saviour Jesus Christ. Grant, O God, that this *sacrifice* may be also full of thy blessing, by the coming of thy most Holy Spirit. Because our Lord, and God, and Sovereign King, Jesus Christ, in the night in which he delivered himself for our sins, and underwent death in his flesh for all, sitting at table with his holy disciples and apostles, took bread in his holy and immaculate and innocent hands, looking up to

heaven to thee his Father, and our God, and the God of all; he gave thanks, blessed it, sanctified it, brake it, and gave it to his holy and blessed disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat."

From the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. *Goar.*

The Prayer of Oblation.

"*Priest.* O Lord God Almighty, who only art holy . . . make us worthy to offer to thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, for our own sins, and the ignorance of the people; and grant, that we may find grace before thee, and that our sacrifice may be acceptable to thee, and that the good spirit of thy grace may dwell in us, and in these offerings, and in all thy people."—Page 74.

From the Syriac Liturgy of St. Basil, one of the most ancient in use among the Syrians. *Renaudot*, tom. ii.

"*The Priest.* O Lord . . . make us worthy to stand before thee, with a pure heart; and to administer and offer to thee this venerable and unbloody sacrifice, for the destruction of our sins," &c.—Page 549.

And here, gentlemen, pay particular attention to the Liturgy of the Nestorians, who separated from us, as I told you, more than 1,400 years ago, millions of whom, still in existence, celebrate Mass, though they separated from the Catholic Church 1,400 years ago.

From the Liturgy used by the Nestorians, called the Liturgy of the Holy Apostles. *Renaudot*, tom. ii.

The Priest bows down before the Altar, and says in secret,

"O Lord, our God . . . by thy inexpressible grace, sanctify this sacrifice," &c.—Page 587.

"Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, pray for me to thy only Son . . . that he would vouchsafe to forgive me my offences and sins, and receive this sacrifice from my weak and sinful hands," &c.—Page 588.

The Priest breaks the host, which he holds in his hands, in two parts; places that which is in his left hand on the paten, and with the other, which he holds in his right hand, he makes a sign over the chalice, saying, "The precious blood is signed with the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Then he dips it to the middle into the chalice, and with it signs the body, which is on the paten, saying, "The holy body is signed with the propitiatory blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

From the Liturgy used by the Nestorians, and called the Liturgy of Theodorus. *Renaudot*, tom. ii.

The Prayer before the Altar.

"*The Priest.* O Lord God . . . grant by thy grace and thy abundant mercies . . . that, while we stand before thee with pure consciences, and offer to thee this living, holy, acceptable, glorious, rational, excellent and unbloody sacrifice, we may find grace and mercy with thee."—Page 616.

"We offer before thy glorious Trinity, with a contrite heart, and in the spirit of humility, this living and holy sacrifice, which is the mystery of the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world."—Page 619.

"*Priest.* May the grace of the Holy Ghost come down upon us, and upon this oblation; may he dwell and infuse himself on this

bread and on this chalice; may he bless, and sanctify, and sign them, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and may the bread, by the virtue of thy name, this bread, I say, be made the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ: and this chalice, the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; that whoever, with true faith, shall eat of this bread, and drink of this chalice, to him they may be, O Lord, the pardon of faults and remission of sins," &c.—Page 621.

From the Liturgy of Nestorius.

Renaudot, tom. ii.

The Priest having invited the people to raise their minds to heaven, where the Seraphim are perpetually singing hymns to the sanctity of God, extends and raises his hands and says, "The living and rational oblation of our first fruits, and the unbloody (*non-immolata*) and acceptable victim of the Son of our race, which prophets mystically foretold; which apostles have openly preached; which martyrs have testified by their blood; which doctors have explained in the Church; which priests have offered and immolated on the holy altar; which Levites have carried in their arms; which the people have received for the expiation of their sins, is now being offered to God, the Lord of all, for all creatures." *Answer*—"It is meet and just."—Pages 626, 627.

"*Priest.* He (Christ) left us a memorial of our salvation, this mystery which we are offering before thee. For when the time was come in which he was delivered up for the life of the world, after he had supped, according to the Pasch of the law of Moses, he took bread into his holy, immaculate, and undefiled hands, he blessed and brake it, and ate, and gave it to his disciples, and said, 'Take, and eat all ye of

it: this is my body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins.'

In like manner, he mixed in the chalice wine and water; he blessed and drank, and gave it to his disciples, and said, 'Drink ye all of it: this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; and so do, in remembrance of me until I come.'"
—Page 629.

"*Priest.* We offer to thee this living, holy, acceptable, excellent, and unbloody *sacrifice*, for all creatures."—Page 630.

From the Coptic Liturgy used by the Jacobites (or Eutychians), called the Liturgy of St. Basil.
Renaudot, tom. i.

Prayer after the Altar is prepared.

"*Priest.* Do thou, O Lord, make us worthy, by the power of thy Holy Spirit, to perform this ministry . . . and offer to thee this *sacrifice* of blessing . . . grant that our *sacrifice* may be accepted before thee, for my sins, and for the follies of thy people," &c.—Page 2.

Prayer of the Kiss of Peace.

"*Priest.* The riches of thy blessings, O Lord, surpass all power of speech, and all conception of the mind. Thou hast hidden from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed to us little ones, those things which prophets and kings coveted to see, and did not see. Thou hast graciously committed these mysteries to us sinners, that we should administer them, and be sanctified by them. Thou hast manifested to us the dispensation of thy Son, and the sacred rite of this *unbloody sacrifice*: for this is not a sacrifice of blood, according to the ancient law; or of justification, according to the flesh; but the Lamb is the spiritual victim, slain by a spiritual and incorporeal

sword, in this sacrifice which we offer to thee."—Page 12.

From the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Basil, taken from the Græco-Arabic.—*Ibid.*

"*Priest.* Do not reject us sinners, who are offering to thee this tremendous and 'unbloody sacrifice,'" p. 57.—"Grant that, with all fear and a pure conscience, we may offer to thee this spiritual and *unbloody sacrifice on this holy altar*," &c.—Page 61.

From the Coptic Liturgy, used by the Jacobites or Eutychians, called the Liturgy of St. Gregory. *Renaudot*, tom. i.

The Prayer of the Veil.

(*The Prayer of the Veil is said near the veil or curtain, before it is drawn to cover the Sanctuary and to conceal the officiating Priest.*)

"*Prayer.* O Lord . . . make me worthy to assist at thy holy altar; let it not turn to my judgment, but may I offer to thee this rational and *unbloody sacrifice* with a pure conscience," &c.—Page 26.

From the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Gregory, taken from the Græco-Arabic.—*Ibid.*

The Prayer of the Veil.

"O King of Glory, through thy inexplicable and immense benignity towards men, thou didst become man without conversion or change, and wert appointed our High-priest. Thou hast committed to us the celebration of this *Liturgical and unbloody sacrifice* . . . make me worthy to stand at thy holy table, and to consecrate thy immaculate body and thy precious blood . . . Thou art he, who dost sanctify and art sanctified; who dost offer, and art offered; who dost accept, and art accepted; who dost give, and art

given; and we give glory to thee, with the Father and the Holy Ghost."—Page 94.

From the Coptic Liturgy, used by the Jacobites or Eutychians, called the Liturgy of St. Cyril. *Renaudot*, tom. i.

The Prayer of Peace.

"*Priest.* Make us all worthy, O Lord, to stand before thee with a pure heart, and a soul full of thy grace, and to offer to thee this holy, rational, spiritual, and *unbloody sacrifice*, for the remission of our sins and the pardon of the ignorances of thy people; because thou art a clement and merciful God, and to thee above we send up our homages of glory, honour, and adoration, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and for ever," &c.—Page 39.

There are several other liturgies besides those which I have mentioned. You have heard, however, my friends, what Archbishop Wake says, and I could quote a long list of Protestant doctors on the subject, *as to the concurrence of all the liturgies in substance*. You have heard all those I have already quoted, using the words "*oblation*" and "*spiritual and unbloody sacrifice*," and I ask you how can you listen with patience to any one, however learned he may be—(and in a few moments you will be regaled with a smooth and placidly-flowing stream, or tempestuous gush of eloquence against them, just as the fit seizes him,)—how, I say, can you listen to any man who will dare to tell you that the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass is a modern invention, a thought of after ages? By what collusion of the monks and of the priests, let my learned friend inform us, was the Sacrifice of the Mass first introduced into Christendom? I come forth here this evening, armed with the records of antiquity; the

learned gentleman comes forward in a different manner, with the subtleties of art, with the thunder of invective, or at least with the poignancy of ridicule, not with logical argument, to invalidate these irresistible testimonies. He will endeavour to make the application of certain texts of St. Paul, overthrow this doctrine of antiquity; but let him, at least, acknowledge the genuineness of these liturgies, or let him sweep away the record of them at once, by exhibiting sound proof of their suppositiousness. One or the other he must do. If he reject them, he is at war with the learned of all ages, and of all countries, and especially of England; he is at war with the whole learned world, with the whole Christian world; and yet I should not be astonished to find that, without caring in the least for the names and reputations of those men of piety and of learning, who have borne testimony to their indisputably authentic stamp, he throws down, with all the arrogance of presumption, the gauntlet of defiance to them all. If, on the other hand, he acknowledges these to be well authenticated records, why the whole affair is at an end, and the Sacrifice of the Mass is most clearly, most triumphantly proved. I shall, however, be prepared to follow him and answer him. I know very well the different texts of St. Paul he will allude to, in order to substantiate his hypothesis.

Gentlemen, as my time is on the point of expiring, I shall produce one more Protestant authority, and one which my learned antagonist affects to revere, as another prop, if it stood in need of it, to support the glorious fabric of the liturgies. Listen to the Protestant Dean Milner, in his History of the Church of Christ, page 415:—"I close," says he, "this digression, if it may

be called one, with remarking, that the continued use of these liturgies in the churches of the West demonstrates the concurrent testimony of antiquity in favour of evangelical doctrine."

Dean Milner is speaking here of the sixth century, when the liturgies were still in use.

[Here the learned gentleman's hour terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—You have listened with the most marked, and, I believe, dispassionate attention, to the rambling but elaborate statements of my learned antagonist. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I was prepared, when I came to this assembly, to hear a defence of the doctrine of the Mass; but, instead of this, we have had appeals to liturgies, appeals to Parnassus, appeals to Horace, and appeals to Virgil—appeals, in short, to every thing under heaven, save to that great standard of appeal, the Word of God. [Strong sensation on the part of the meeting, and cries of "Order!"]

Mr. FRENCH.—I really must request that those gentlemen making this interruption do be quiet, and not manifest any applause.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—My learned antagonist stated, at the outset of his remarks, that *I* had challenged *him* to this discussion. Now I do not think it worth while to enter on any explanation of the origin of this discussion—I would merely add, that *he it was who challenged me, and again and again summoned me to meet him*. My opponent reminded me, as he reminded the meeting, of my having stated—and I dare say my tongue betrays it—that I was "an undaunted son of Scotia." I do not hesitate to acknowledge my country, and I have a little of the spirit, let me add, of a Highland bag-piper, of the 42d Regiment at

Waterloo, who was taken prisoner by the French. The emperor ordered him to play one of his national airs, and he did so; he was commanded to play a *pibroch*, and he did so; he ordered him to play an advance, and he did so; he was next ordered to play a charge, and he did so; and then Napoleon, who was very much pleased and delighted with the minstrel and his music, said, "Now then, play a retreat, and I shall have done." "No," said Donald, "I never learned to play a *retreat*."

My learned antagonist, in putting this question of the Mass before the meeting, adduced arguments on the subject of the Catholic Church, the Rule of Faith, &c. &c.—in fact, he touched the *summa fastigia* of almost every point of the controversy. Among other odd questions, he asked, "Where was your Church, the Protestant Church, at such and such a period?" and then boasted of the Roman Catholic Church being seen from the beginning. Yes, I reply, the Roman Church was often seen, but in places where she had better have hid her head; she was seen kindling the fires and presiding over the faggots of Smithfield; she is still seen in the Bull Unigenitus, where the secular arm is called in to compel men to renounce those doctrines which their fathers sealed in their hearts' best blood. She was seen, moreover, in the fourth Council of the Lateran, where she had much better have retired to concealment; and if she now possessed aught of the modesty of the chaste spouse of the Redeemer, she would veil her face in sackcloth and in ashes, and mourn over those deeds which were done in the sacred but injured names of religion and morality.

He next requested me—and I will repeat his own words—to show in what year (nay, he is so kind and

so charitable, that he will allow me great latitude) in which fifty years, or century, the Mass first made its exit. Now, the question, to my mind, is not *when* the Mass *arose*, but *where* the Mass *is*? The question I will ask the learned gentleman, and require him to solve is, *is the Mass here* (in the Bible) *or is it not?* and if it be not *here*, rest assured it is not of God. Let me illustrate and make clear my point by a familiar reference. I supposed, last evening, that a taint of a virulent and poisonous character had mingled with the waters of the Thames; and I supposed that, being anxious to find out the precise point of its commencement, we had recourse to the analysis and tests of the chemist. Let me apply this illustration to our present question.

My antagonist says, I call on you to show where this taint began. I commence my chemical analysis, and try it by every test, and I find that it grows less and less apparent as we go upwards; but as we advance, it becomes so faint that neither the microscope can detect it, nor the analysis of the chemist discover its existence. At this juncture a peasant walks up and says, "Pray, gentlemen, what's the use of bothering your heads *where* it began? can you not go to the *fountain-head* and see if it be there? because if it is in the fountain, of course it will be found through the whole stream; but if not, it is childish and worse than contemptible trifling, to try and ascertain *where* it subsequently began." Or to illustrate this point still more clearly—for these truths need to be hammered into my antagonist's mind, as he has either misunderstood or misinterpreted me—suppose two sisters go into their garden, on a May morning, to look at their gooseberry bushes and apple trees, whose fresh and un-

folding buds tell of the approach of spring-time. One of them sees a caterpillar on one of the loveliest branches of a rose-tree, and observes, "This is clearly part and parcel of this rose-tree;" the other says, "My dear, you are utterly mistaken; it is a caterpillar, it is no part of the tree whatever." "Well," says the other, "only show me the precise period in the night when the caterpillar crept on the tree, and I will believe that it is not a *part* of the tree, but a caterpillar." What would the other naturally say? "The question is not the hour of the night *when* it crept on the tree, but, is it a *part* of the parent tree, or is it not? One says it is not, the other says it is: examine the caterpillar and examine the rose-tree, and thereby ascertain whether the caterpillar belongs to it or not!" Now that is just what I say with regard to the doctrine of the Mass. Let Mr. French go to this standard of appeal, the Bible, and if the Mass can be proved from this book, which Mr. French acknowledges to be from God—which he acknowledges to be inspired, then I shall, most willingly, admit the dogma; but if my learned friend cannot prove it to exist in this book, then I say I shall treat the question, *when* it began, as childish drivelling; an effort to avoid the main point at issue—whether it be the inspiration of God, or the concoction of man. I *can* lay sufficient evidence before this assembly, of the mode in which the Mass arose. Dupin, the celebrated Roman Catholic historian, admits that in the ninth century, "there were great contests on the subject of Transubstantiation;" and as it is the child of Transubstantiation, I conceive, there is more than a presumption that it may have crept into the world at that time, when you

recollect the darkness, the ignorance, and superstition of the middle ages—when you bear in mind that the priests alone had the little remnant of learning which was left—when, with these facts, you also keep in mind that revelation and experience also demonstrate man to be too fallible, too guilty a creature, not to have availed himself of his superiority, amid the surrounding degradation, to turn the elements of power to the means of profit and pre-eminence, and ultimately to put his foot in the stirrup and ride rough-shod over the liberties of man and the revelations of God!

The next remark I have picked up in the statement of my learned antagonist is made in reference to the Church of England Prayer-book, in which it is said, "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received by the *faithful*." Now, mark you, if I wanted the most decisive and striking disproof of Transubstantiation on the part of the Church of England, I would just refer to the passage quoted by my opponent—"They are verily and indeed received by the *faithful*." By the *faithful*, not by *all*! But observe—in the Romish Church there is no such discrimination—the body and blood of Christ are received verily and indeed by *all*, whether they be *faithful* or *unfaithful*. By the Church of England, the faithful only receive the body and blood of Christ, which shows that there is no Transubstantiation.

My learned antagonist adduced next, in support of the Mass, a beautiful quotation from one of the classics. It was rather odd to have recourse to the heathen classics for Christianity. This is his matter, however. But I must repeat, that the question is not whether the

Mass is to be found in Virgil or in Homer; and I have strong suspicions that it is not there. The question is—whether it be announced in the page of truth, in the inerrant and infallible word of God. “*To the law and to the testimony.*” If it be not according to that, it is “because there is no truth in it.”

I find my opponent still repeats his oft-reiterated question, Where was your Church—where was your Church during this and that period, when this doctrine crept in and that doctrine crept out? My opponent clearly dates our Church at the era of the Reformation. My answer is that which has been often given. A priest asked an Irish reader, “Where was your Church before the Reformation? Yours is but an upstart and a modern communion; ours is the ancient Church.” The reader, with great naïveté, replied, “Where was your reverence’s face before it was washed this morning?” The answer implied that the Churches at the Reformation underwent a process of purification, by having the corruptions of nine or twelve centuries washed away by the hands of those memorable men, Luther, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. Corruptions had accumulated and vitiated Zion’s fair face, until all the primeval traces of her glory were covered, and at intervals only did there evolve beams indicative of her divine birth, which corruption could not quench. The reformers washed away the defilement, and Knox and others, I admit, grazed her features a little in their anxiety to purify her of the abominations which encrusted them. Thus purified, she at length looked forth “bright as the sun,” “fair as the moon,” and “terrible as an army with banners.”

My learned antagonist next alluded to the Rule of Faith; but I have again to remind the meeting that this is not the question of discussion this evening. Most happy shall I be to discuss the Rule of Faith when the time comes, and I am prepared to demonstrate that the great Rule of Faith, the *only* Rule of Faith is, in the words of the immortal Chillingworth, “*the Bible, and the Bible alone.*” But I am not at all of a mind that it becomes me to enter on the Rule of Faith, when the real question before the meeting is the doctrine of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.

The next quotation—and much do I dislike irrelevant points, but courtesy requires me to follow him—the next quotation of my antagonist was a large piece of poetry, I should think of one hundred and twenty lines, in which the poet sang, *de multis rebus et quibusdam aliis*. I thought the learned gentleman had burnt his fingers by quoting poetry on a previous evening, and, like a burnt child, feared the fire. You all recollect he quoted a piece of rhyme from Aquinas, to teach me a little better theology, and as he had given us a taste of St. Thomas’s poetry, I gave him a taste of St. Thomas’s prose, as embodied in the *Secunda Secundæ* of Thomas Aquinas, where he approves and presses eloquently a sure process for “the extermination of heretics;” and to show you, while speaking of Aquinas, that this was not merely the sentiment of a private doctor, I laid before you the fact that there is an express prayer in the Missal, in which every Romanist prays “we may have light to understand his doctrine, and to be edified by his example.” The Muses will not help the Church of Rome out of her difficulties. Besides, poets are not the most sober wits.

"The poet's eye in a fine phrenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from
earth to heaven,
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet's
pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy
nothing
A local habitation and a name."

My learned antagonist is not ignorant of an equally apposite passage from Horace:—

"Pictoribus atque poetis,
Quid libet audendi semper fuit æqua
potestas,
Scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim."

I consign poetic arguments to the "tomb of all the Capulets."

My antagonist repeated towards the close of his speech what he dwelt on towards the commencement. My faithful pursuit of my antagonist is my apology for recurring to it. My opponent repeated his query, Where was your Church before this or that period? I have given you illustrations of it, drawn from the reply of the Irish Scripture reader. The next reply, and I hope it will satisfy my learned friend, is, The Protestant Church *was* and is where the Roman Catholic Church *is not*, viz. in the Word of God; or, if I concede to my Roman Catholic auditors, that the Roman Catholic Church *is here* in the Bible, she is here, I would add, with a brand upon her brow, "THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY." I might show my friend that his Church is in the Bible, but in most ominous fellowship, and under most startling symbols; I could show her in the eighteenth chapter of the Book of Revelations; I could show her in the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians; I could show her in some of the olden prophecies—and in all proclaimed as a fearful apostasy.

My antagonist next flattered himself he had found the Mass in the year of our Lord 260. In his chase

after this phantom he got so near the apostles as the year 160, and I really began to hope he would ascend higher still, and adduce the authorities of A.D. 60 or 80 after our Lord, but, alas! he fought desperately shy of that period; he would go up to 160 for the Mass, but he would not dare to approach a century nearer, lest he should meet the Bible and be confounded. There must be some reason for this; my opponent must have some reason for fighting so shy of the apostles and the word of God. He ran from these with precipitate speed, and endeavoured to hide himself in the tremendous forest presented by the fathers, where, if you drive him away from one mouldering trunk, he runs directly to another, and like an American rifleman in his native woods, he fires under cover of the spreading trees and bushes till I dislodge him and drive him to another. He dreads the field of open and generous battle; he fears the field of inspiration and the light of day; he skulks and skirmishes any where, save on the broad platform of the oracles of the living God.

My opponent next adduced several so-called ancient liturgies, and from these he read what he thought remarkable descriptions of the Mass. Now, I would reply, we do not deny that there is a Christian sacrifice. We say praise is a sacrifice, prayer is a sacrifice, the bodies of believers are sacrifices, (Rom. xii. 1.)—"I beseech you by the mercies of God, present your bodies *living sacrifices* unto God, which is your reasonable service." But my learned opponent, you observe, like too many of his side, when they come to controversy, put their best foot forward, and take care, if they can, to keep out the obnoxious Word that involves the whole error.

Accordingly, my opponent endeavoured to avail himself of this liberty. He omitted the word "propitiatory." The language that is used to describe the Mass, language which my opponent cannot question, is "A TRUE, PROPER, AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE FOR THE SINS OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD;" and, in order that your views may be completely settled on the meaning of the Mass, for my learned antagonist has scarcely ventured to give you a faithful account of the views of his own Church, I shall read from the Creed of Pope Pius IV.—a creed to which Mr. French, *ex animo*, subscribes:—"I profess likewise that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.—Profiteor pariter in Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium, et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis."

The next extract definitive of the Mass which I shall read is from the canon of the Council of Trent:—

CANON I. "If any shall say that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that what is offered is nothing else than that Christ is given to us to eat, let him be accursed."

CANON II. "If any shall say that in these words, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' Christ did not appoint the apostles to be priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed."

CANON III. "If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice which was made upon the cross, but not propitiatory, or that it only profits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains,

satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed."

Let me remark, *en passant*, that the Council of Trent here asserts, if any one says, "Do this in remembrance of me," does not mean that Christ did appoint the apostles to be priests to sacrifice his body and blood, let him be accursed." Now, my learned friend twitted and taunted me for the use of the word "orientalism," and he has dilated most largely on the laws and properties of metaphors and figures. I ask, with this canon in my hand, who it is that uses metaphors and figures? The common adage is most useful here—"They who dwell in glass houses should be very careful not to throw stones." You find that the canon of the Council of Trent, or the Church of Rome, says, "Do this in remembrance of me," means *Sacrifice* me for the *remission* of the sins of the living and the dead. I thought my friend's Church was all *literality*. I thought that every word must be taken in its exact, precise, and literal sense; and, on that supposition, I most clearly and logically demonstrated that my learned opponent is a bundle of grass; for it is written "all flesh is grass," "*surely* the people is grass." But now, when he finds it suitable, or rather, when his Church finds it suitable to her views, she departs from the *literal* interpretation, and fastens upon the *figurative*—the "oriental;" since, in her vocabulary, "Do this in remembrance of me," means, "sacrifice this;" and all who do not make up their minds to perpetrate this hyper-orientalism, are under anathema. Rare consistency! most infallible Church! One other definition to show Rome's unity in error, and I have done. It is from *The Abridgement of Christian Doctrine*, revised by Dr. Doyle:—

“Question.—Is the Holy Eucharist or Mass a Sacrifice?”

“Answer.—It is the *unbloody* Sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which he himself instituted at the last Supper.”

Before I proceed to take up the few arguments of my opponent that bore upon the point at issue, I think it is important to keep before your minds the fact, that he was most anxious to lead you to believe that Transubstantiation was *proved*;—he seemed, I say, most anxious to require from you the postulate, that Transubstantiation is a Scripture tenet. Now, every one before me will recollect the arguments I adduced on that topic, and the conclusion is, no doubt, come to by every one in this assembly, that if my friend holds the necessity of a literal interpretation of these words, “This is my body,” the most monstrous consequences—such as my opponent’s favourite poets, Aquinas and Horace, never imagined—necessarily ensue—as that this vast audience is not flesh and blood, but actually *grass*; Judah is turned into “a lion’s whelp;” Agar into Mount Sinai, and other similar offspring legitimately fathered on Transubstantiation. But why is my learned antagonist so anxious to plead for Transubstantiation—to entreat you to grant him it as a basis? He well knows that if Transubstantiation is overthrown, the Mass has not a leg to stand on; that if Transubstantiation be untrue, the Mass must necessarily be a fantasy. But were I to concede Transubstantiation (and such are the riches of truth that on this point of the controversy I could afford to do so, and admit it true, as I do not), I can yet disprove the Mass without, and independent of the postulate, that Transubstantiation is false; in other words, I can pursue a course perfectly indepen-

dent of either of these postulates, and this you will find this evening, by the arguments which I shall bring forward on the question. Before doing so, however, I would only observe, that my learned antagonist, after I had taken up and smashed every point he brought forward, as far as I could follow him, in support of Transubstantiation, found that his legs were actually removed from beneath him, and was therefore content to hobble off the platform on two crutches, which I believe were kindly given to him by his reverend friend on his left (Mr. Sisk). I came to this meeting, Mr. Chairman, expecting to construct a speech, by being called on to reply to the arguments brought forward by my learned friend; but he has brought forward *no arguments* at all—he has scarcely even defined the subject—he has left the Mass to stand on its own assumptions, and plead for itself as it best may. And therefore I expect that, in his next speech before the meeting, he will bring all the artillery of the Vatican fully to bear upon this question, and try, at least, to overthrow those sentiments which we Protestants have been accustomed to entertain on the Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross.

Let me remind you how my opponent stated, in the course of his remarks last evening, that our Protestant translation was wilfully incorrect, in the First Epist. Cor. xi. 27. Our translation is—“Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, *and* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.” He contended that the Greek word being *ἢ*, the proper translation is, “eat this bread *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, ye shall be guilty of the body and blood of the

Lord." Let me inform you that our translators were by no means unacquainted with all that had been previously written and produced upon the subject. They had a sight of the *Alexandrian and Cambridge MSS.* and two later manuscripts, all four having *καί*, and let me add also, that the SYRIAC, the ETHIOPIC, and COPTIC versions have all *and* and not *or*. I have no hesitation in asserting that the authentic Greek is *καί*, not *ή*. My learned antagonist is fondly attached to antiquity—he rejoices to appeal to ancient documents and standards; I go to them, and I find *AND*, not *OR*, in these most ancient and venerable documents. Besides, the apostle explains his meaning in the following verses, in which *AND* is invariably used: (ver. 29.) "He that eateth *AND* drinketh." (ver. 26.) "As often as ye eat this bread *AND* drink this cup." To receive the blood in the flesh without drinking the blood, does not prove that we are freed from the denunciation involved in the words; or, on the other hand, that communion in one kind is scriptural and right. My opponent says the apostle intends that eating the bread alone implies being guilty of *both* body and blood, and that drinking the cup alone implies being guilty of the body and blood *both*. Now, as he asked the question how this can be, I avail myself of an Irishman's privilege, and reply to that question by asking another: How is it that a man by breaking *one* commandment is guilty of *all*? When my learned friend has solved my question it will be time enough to solve his.

His next text was, "not discerning the Lord's body." He alleged that we use the literal sense of the English words, "not discerning," as if they referred to the eye, and that this was not the meaning of the

word *Διακρίνω*, which means "to perceive by the mind," and not "by the eye." And then he says, that "not discerning the Lord's body" must imply, that the Lord's body is actually present, and that we Protestants only do not discern it. In the first place, let me observe, that the apostle speaks of certain Corinthian converts who came to the table of the Lord intoxicated. They did not, says the apostle, make a distinction between their ordinary meals and the table of the Lord, (and, by the bye, that possibility of *intoxication* is an extraordinary result, if it be the *literal blood* of Christ in the cup, and not any longer wine.) Certain Corinthian converts came intoxicated, and Paul asks with holy and apostolic indignation, "What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" and then he says, "ye come to the table *not discerning*," *not making a distinction* between the Lord's Supper, which is a sacred symbol of his body and blood, and your ordinary meals; and ye are therefore chargeable with the awful guilt of most licentiously and blasphemously drinking of the communion wine to excess.

To show you still further the use of the word "discern," I find, in 1 Cor. ii. 14, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are *spiritually discerned*. But he that is spiritual judgeth and discerneth." The very same original word is used. The Church of Rome says, "not discerning the Lord's body" means that we Protestants do not, because we disbelieve Transubstantiation. We say Christ's body is *spiritually* discerned. The Church of Rome does not discern it *literally*, and she does not discern it *spiritually*; and therefore I conceive that she most probably partakes, in some

measure, of the guilt of the Corinthian converts.

My learned friend has referred to the ancient liturgies connected with the subject of the Mass, and illustrative of its import. I will also refer to some important documents on this subject. In referring to the fathers, mark you, I would attach to them but a secondary importance, and, as I told you, I am prepared, when we discuss the Rule of Faith, to prove yet more clearly, that the fathers either contradict each other, and contradict themselves, or flatly contradict the Church of Rome. I said, therefore, the right way would be to appeal from the contradictory fathers to the harmonious and consentaneous statements of the Word of God. But to show you, in this matter, that if my opponent produce one testimony from the fathers—all of whom, as he well knows, were in the habit of using the most metaphorical, the most oriental and symbolic language—if he produces one testimony from a father that seems to imply that either Transubstantiation or the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass was known to them, I will refer among others to Justyn Martyr, in his "Apology for Christians," second vol. p. 97, Paris, 1615, and read his account of the celebration of the Lord's day, and see if there be anything in that account of a whole Church service that will warrant the inference, that the Roman Mass was then known. And, mind you, this document is *considerably older than the liturgies* which my friend has so copiously quoted:—

"When we have ended our prayers," says Justyn Martyr, "we embrace each other with a kiss, &c. Then the bread and the cup of water and of the wine mixed with it, is offered to the President of the brethren, and he, taking it, offers up

praise and glory to the Father of all, in the name of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and, at some length, he performs a thanksgiving for having been honoured by these things beside him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present joyfully cry out, Amen, amen. Amen signifies, in the Hebrew language, so be it. But the President, having returned thanks, and all the people having joyfully cried out, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those who are present a portion of the bread, and the wine, and the water, over which a thanksgiving has been performed, and they carry away some for those who are not present; and this food is called by us the Eucharist, of which no one is permitted to partake but he who believes that the things taught to us are true, and who has been washed for the remission of sins, and for regeneration, and who lives as Christ has enjoined. For we do not receive these things as common bread or common drink. But, as the incarnate Jesus became, by the Word of God, Christ our Saviour, and received flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught, that the food which is made the Eucharist, by the prayer, according to his word, by which *our flesh and blood are nourished*, is both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.

"And on the day that is called Sunday, there is an assembly in the same place of those who dwell in towns, or in the country, and the histories of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read whilst the time permits; then, the reader ceasing, the President verbally admonishes and exhorts the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise in common, and offer prayers, and, as we have already said, when we have finished our prayers, bread

and wine and water (after consecration) are offered, and the President, in like manner, offers prayers and thanksgiving, as far as it is in his power to do so (*extemporaneous prayers*), and the people joyfully cry out, saying, Amen."

Observe, this is a description, a minute description, or history of a Christian Sabbath solemnity. Is there one syllable here about the Mass? Is there not the utmost Protestant possible simplicity in the whole ceremonial? We read nothing about the *procession of the Host*—nothing about the *elevation of the Host*—nothing about the *adoration of the Host*. We have just a simple account of praise and prayer, and next, that bread and wine were consecrated and given by priests and deacons to such believers as were thought worthy. We read here, that the cup was also given; but *is* the cup given in the Church of Rome? No; the Church of Rome conceded it, for eleven centuries, to the people, but it became expedient to withdraw it, because, according to Delahogue, some communicants "spilled the wine," which is believed to be the blood of Christ, and because it became expedient also to exalt the priesthood in the eyes of the laity, by peculiar distinctions. It is here said, that, along with bread and wine, "he presents the prayers and thanksgivings;" and then the remark is added, "our flesh and blood are *nourished by the sacramental elements*."

Will my learned antagonist be prepared to acquiesce in this sentiment, that his flesh and blood is nourished by the sacrifice of "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God?" Will he admit, what Justyn Martyr distinctly declares—that, by the elements on the Holy table, our bodies are nourished;

or, in other words, that these elements, by a process of assimilation, become turned into our flesh and blood? The Church of Rome anathematizes the opinion of Justyn Martyr. Neither my opponent nor his Church admit that the Host nourishes our flesh. The fact is, the Church of Rome treats the fathers, as some proud upstart in the world would treat a flattering sycophant: as long as the latter pleases him by his obsequious adulations; says what he says, bows when he bows, and thinks as he thinks, so long is he treated with courtesy and kindness; but if the said sycophant, in a moment of forgetfulness, says any thing to displease his patron, the latter immediately rings the bell, and straightway shows him down stairs [Laughter.] Now, this is an exact portrait of the way the Roman Catholic treats the fathers. As long as they play into the lap of the Church of Rome, so long as their highly figurative phraseology can be turned and twisted into meaning the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass; as long as the fathers, either by silence or implication, or positive assertion, speak as she wants them, she treats with contempt the "upstarts of the nineteenth century," such as Calvin and your humble servant, &c.; nay, she treats the Word of God with something like contempt—though I will not impute it to my learned friend, for I believe he has a reverence for that word. Remember, then, this document, which I have read to you, was written before any or all the liturgies which my friend quoted; and in this history of Justyn Martyr, there is no mention of the Mass, or any thing like it. Here is a file for my friend, the admirer of the fathers, to bite [Laughter]: here is a knot which I call on our learned *Ædipus* to explain. He glories in the

fathers; I go to the fathers, and read from Justyn Martyr this simple, this Protestant account of a Christian sabbath assembly, in which neither Mass nor Transubstantiation occur; and my opponent brings forward long *subsequent* documents, mind you, to Justyn's, and exclaims, "if Justyn knew nothing about the Mass, his successors do!" He glories in the fathers! Well, I go to the fathers, and I find one of them disproving the antiquity of the Mass by his knowing nothing of it; and, after all, we Protestants are not such "upstarts," that there is nothing historical and ancient on our side; and I declare, that if Justyn Martyr had lived in the days of the Inquisition, he would have been incarcerated in one of its cells; if he had lived in the days of the Council of Trent, he would have been laid under its most terrible anathema, had he dared to have uttered such things; his book would have been placed in the *Index Expurgatorius*, and his mouth soon shut. But, blessed be God, he lived in a better and a brighter age, and nearer to apostolic days, when that overshadowing and destructive despotism had not yet risen to its gigantic empire, nor attained so fell a dominion; when men could speak out without fear of the faggot and the flame, or of the proscription of the Lateran, and the revolting scenes of Smithfield. I must give you another quotation, as my friend has referred to it, from the celebrated Tertullian. He quoted, you recollect, on the Mass the prophecy of Malachi, which I call on my friend to prove refers to the Mass at all. On this text he quoted certain extracts, and he professed to show—(now I call your special attention to this, in order to show how necessary it is to go from the fathers to the grand-

fathers, the apostles and evangelists)—that all the fathers were unanimous on the interpretation of this passage, and referred it to the Mass precisely in the way that he explained it. Now, you will remember, that my learned friend is under a special pledge, according to the creed of Pope Pius IV. "not to interpret the Bible, unless according to the *unanimous* consent of the fathers." As the fathers are *not* unanimous, as I have already demonstrated, and as I am prepared still further to demonstrate, this injunction is tantamount to a direct prohibition to my learned friend, to interpret God's Word at all. Until he has found the "unanimity" of the fathers, he may not interpret God's Word at all. The unanimity of the fathers! Why, he might as well try to find one seed of corn, amid millions and millions more of bushels of chaff. But let me add that, if there were ten thousand fathers who said one thing, and only ONE PAUL who said another, Paul would be right and the ten thousand fathers would be utterly wrong. I repeat it, if there were *twenty times ten thousand fathers who all said one thing*—(which they do *not*—the very reverse is the fact)—and if *one Paul put a veto on that one thing*—then I say that *one Paul* would be *right*, and the twenty times ten thousand fathers *totally wrong*.

But to my point, for I am following out his speech, and thereby treating him with far more courtesy than he displayed toward me; for he fought so shy of my speech, that if it had been infected with typhus fever or plague, he could not have kept a more respectful distance. I will not keep at such a distance from him.

But my learned opponent states that *all* the fathers are unanimous in their interpretation of that passage

in the Book of the Prophet Malachi which he quoted from the first chapter, ver. eleventh, of Malachi, and declares it to refer to the Mass. Now I give you a quotation from one of the fathers, viz. Tertullian, who flourished in the year 194. I give you this quotation in order to show the *unanimity!!* of the fathers upon this passage of Malachi. Tertullian says — “He says, by the angel Malachi, one of the twelve prophets, ‘I will not accept of an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering, for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts.’ Also David says, in the Psalms, ‘Offer unto God, ye lands of the Gentiles’—doubtless because the preaching of the apostles ought to go forth into every land,—‘offer to God honour and renown. Offer unto God the sacrifice due unto his name.’ Forasmuch as we must not appease God with earthly, but with *spiritual* sacrifices; as we read it written, ‘An humble and contrite heart is a sacrifice to God.’ And elsewhere, ‘The sacrifices to God are sacrifices of praise,’ and, ‘Pay thy vows to the Most High.’ Thus, therefore, *spiritual sacrifices* are meant, and a *contrite heart* is shown to be an *acceptable sacrifice* to God.”—*Tertul. against Jews*, chap. v. p. 188. Paris, 1675.

My opponent says the fathers are unanimous on the text from Malachi, on its referring to the Sacrifice of the Mass. Tertullian at least declares it does not refer to any propitiatory sacrifice. I have quoted this passage merely to reply to his groundless assumption; and I am sure that if you contemplated the face of my learned antagonist, you

must have seen a blush overspread his cheek when he stated that *all* the fathers were unanimous in referring to the Mass this verse of the prophet Malachi. I will not prescribe him any penance for the fault he has committed. I give him full absolution on this condition—that he will recant his strong and groundless statements, when he stands up in his next speech, and say, I said “unanimous,” as *lucus a non lucendo*, when I really meant to say they were contradictory of each other. [Laughter, and calls of “Order!”]

I have thus replied to such of my antagonist’s points as I could collect. I now wish to make a few remarks in closing, for I have only a few minutes left. In the first place, let it be remembered, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the great act of worship in which the Church of Rome is so distinctively engaged, that a Roman Catholic, to express worship, usually says, “going to Mass,” “I am going to hear Mass.” Now, I have shown you that Justyn Martyr was clearly a Protestant, or at least, that he was no Roman Catholic. All the apostles seem to have caught the same contagion of Protestantism. I first call your attention to the commission given to the apostles:—“Go and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” Here is the Saviour’s commission to the apostles. We find them commissioned to baptize, to preach, to distribute bread and wine, as the apostle says, which is the consecrated symbol of the body and blood of Christ, according to the “injunction” of their divine Master:—“For I received of the Lord Jesus that which also I de-

livered unto you." But we do not find one solitary commission to go and say *Mass* "in every country."

Again, I call your attention to the letters to Timothy and Titus, two evangelists and bishops of the Christian Church. Here one would have expected that, when the apostle was writing to these distinguished ministers, he would have given some directions such as I quoted on a former evening, respecting the accidents of the Mass, the adoration, procession, and elevation of the Host. In the passages I quoted from *De Defectibus Missæ*, it is said, that "any animal" may carry away the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God; that a mouse, a rat, or a dog—any animal may do it. It is also virtually declared, that if the vintner have furnished bad wine, it is no consecration. It is virtually said, that if the baker have sent you meal instead of flour, it is no consecration. Now, observe, the Church of Rome thus becomes dependent on her vintner, or her wine-merchant, and her baker, for valid Transubstantiation and Sacrifice. Now, one would have thought that the apostles would have been earnest in warning them against the use of bad flour and corrupt wine; against animals carrying away the Host, or the wind blowing it away; but not one syllable upon the subject—not a hint about the Mass—not a whisper about this "propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead!" In those infallible annals, the Acts of the Apostles, we do not find one syllable about offering the Mass—not one word about "a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."

Now, I admit this is a negative argument. I meet him on the lowest ground; but surely it is a marvellous fact, that neither in the

commission given to the apostles, nor in the letters written by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, nor in the Acts of the Apostles, in which are recorded their histories and their exploits, is there one syllable respecting the main portion of Roman Catholic worship—the Mass. Now, I call on my opponent to show that the word of God declares or announces the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass for the sins of the living and the dead, in any shape or way whatsoever. You have heard a great deal about ancient liturgies. I will refer you to one, partly ancient and partly modern—the Missal of the Roman Catholic Church for the use of the Laity. The Ordinary of the Mass, in this document, begins thus:—"I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, to all the saints," &c.

"Therefore, I beseech the blessed Mary, ever a Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and you, O Father, to pray to the Lord our God for us."

This cannot be an apostolic document, for who could ever dream of the likelihood of Peter confessing to *himself*? or of Paul confessing to *himself*? "I, Peter, confess to holy Peter!!" Now, is it likely that, if this part of the Roman Catholic Missal had been concocted in the days of Paul, St. Paul would have said, "I confess to St. Paul?" And, therefore, I presume that my friend must necessarily be driven to the position, that this liturgy, or Ordinary of the Mass, must be of recent date—at least, that it is neither of apostolic origin, nor an apostolic document; he must come to the conclusion that it crept in at

a subsequent date; (my friend, who requires the hour of the origin of any thing to enable him to reject or receive it, will be perfectly *able*, no doubt, to explain the precise *date* at which it crept in.) I have shown you when it *did not* exist, viz. in the apostolic times. We find another odd prayer in the Ordinary of the Mass:—"We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints, whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou wouldest vouchsafe to forgive me all my sins."

No such phraseology as this—no such divinity as this—was known in apostolic times. In God's word we do not read of any merit in any saint to deserve forgiveness of sins. The doctrine of apostolic days is, "In whom (in Christ) we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" but I read in this document—by the merit of the saints whose relics are here, we have the forgiveness of sins.

There is, therefore, more than a strong presumption, that this document can by no means claim the superscription of an inspired penman, whose language is so expressly its antipodes. "In *Christ* we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." But (for my time is fast drawing to a close,) let me observe, that this Missal is quite a nondescript document. It is a mosaic work of the novel and the antique. In some parts it involves a disbelief in Transubstantiation, when it says—"May thy body, which I have received, and thy blood, which I have drunk, cleave to my bowels." A strange prayer, if it be Christ's literal flesh and blood! It would then imply that his must be assimilated with ours, which is monstrous. And there is a prayer to God to "accept this Host as thou were graciously pleased to accept the gifts of thy

just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of the patriarch, Abraham."

The priest here prays that God would accept the body and blood of Christ, just as he accepted the gift of Abel. If bread and wine, the prayer is just; but if not, it is almost blasphemy.

I had intended to go over the whole of this document to show you that it contains sentiments and statements which sometimes advocate the dogma of Transubstantiation, and sometimes plainly contradict it. It is a mixed production; its modern parts being full of the Roman Catholic dogmas of later years, and its more ancient fragments evidently containing an opposite and purer theology.

I invite my opponent to the true standard—the Word of God. It is the grand criterion of truth and error. All arguments from the oracles of truth I am prepared to canvass and to reply to. Its announcements, and its announcements alone, are final.

[The reverend gentleman's hour here expired.]

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen—I came into this room, armed with documentary evidence of the most indisputable nature, to prove the antiquity of the Sacrifice of the Mass; and I did expect that the learned gentleman would have condescended to answer some of those strong arguments which I adduced upon the occasion, if possible, in a substantial and irrefragable manner. But I find that he has pursued precisely the same line of argumentation with which he has reproached me so often; that is, of making a long and a rambling speech, full of figures and metaphorical allusions, much more beautiful, more brilliant and more elegantly-flowing than my own, but

in which, as I contend, and which I will prove to you satisfactorily before I sit down, he has not advanced one single argument to overthrow the strength of those irrefragable liturgies, which cry out, in loud and in solemn accents, and which will cry out to the end of time, in favour of the doctrine of the Catholic Mass. I asked him, naturally, as it was my duty to do, I asked him to point out the time when the Mass was introduced into Christendom, and among the various nations of the world; and what, what has been his answer? His reply is, "I cannot tell you *when* it was introduced; all I can tell you is, it is not in the Bible or New Testament." That, you observe, was not the object of my inquiry. I may not be, I willingly confess, so acute as the learned gentleman himself, in applying my wits to the New Testament, for I cannot find events recorded there which happened nearly three centuries after. My question was not, when I alluded to those liturgies, which were written subsequently to the New Testament, (for those liturgies, though said from apostolic times, were not committed to writing until three or four centuries after the apostolical days,) whether they could be discovered within the sacred volume or not; but I want to know, and indeed we are all anxious to know, amid the variety and multiplicity of sects that overspread this land, which is the true religion; which is the ancient one; which adheres to, and which departs from, the meaning and the spirit of those identical liturgies which were framed by the apostles themselves, most indisputably, as to their substantial parts. I had recourse, my friends, in tracing our religion, to our libraries; I took down her books of sacred antiquity—books that are approved of and acknow-

ledged by Protestants as well as by Catholics, and these all preach and inculcate the doctrine of the Catholic Mass. And when I came to this room, I threw these documents before my learned friend, and I am answered with ten thousand metaphors, but not one solid and substantial argument. The fact, therefore, remains unshaken and unquestioned—namely, that the fathers of the Church believed in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, believed in the doctrine of the Mass, celebrated Mass, and taught it in every region of the world; for the learned gentleman has not overthrown that argument: he has attempted, indeed, to call it in question by one passage from St. Jerome, and by another from Justyn Martyr, and to both these very authorities I shall also beg leave to call your attention. I shall first take Justyn. My learned friend, in his acute, logical, view of this subject, sees a great deal of inconsistency in our doctrine; I, for my part, see none, and I shall endeavour to prove to you that there is a perfect consonance in our Catholic doctrine, where the learned gentleman sees nothing but dissonance and disorder. The words are:—"Our prayers being finished," says St. Justyn, "we embrace one another with the kiss of peace."

And here I may remark, as I proceed, that even to this very day, at our holy altars, and during the ministration of those sacred rites which have been transmitted to us, apostolically, from age to age, the priests, in a solemn manner, during some parts of the sacred rites, respectfully, at the foot of the altar, give one another what is called "the kiss of peace." That custom is kept up, just as it was in the days of Justyn Martyr, who laid down his life for our blessed Saviour, in the second century. These are his

own words:—"Our prayers being finished, we embrace one another with the kiss of peace. Then to him who presides over the brethren, is presented bread and wine tempered with water; having received which he gives glory to the Father of all things, in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and returns thanks, in many prayers, that he has been deemed worthy of these gifts." Justyn then goes on to inform the Roman Emperor what is this Eucharist, in language which you have already had laid before you.

Now, I am really astonished, gentlemen, at this oversight of my antagonist. My friend has told you that he noticed—(and no doubt he did in his own poetical and fanciful imagination)—he has told you, I say, that he noticed something like the tinge of a blush on my cheek; but I wonder how he can dare to take Justyn Martyr in his hand without the deepest blush that ever spread on the cheek of man! Here is a father, living near the time of Christ, who ought to have known something of "pure and unadulterated Christianity," and what does he tell you? Listen! and, my friends, if there be a man in England capable of subtilizing away the strength and the spirit of words, and making them evaporate into nothing, it is my learned opponent, with whom I have the honour of reasoning this day; and yet, with this his subtilizing ingenuity, I defy him, without vitiating all the rules of language, without overturning all the laws, all the principles of logic and of grammar, to deduce any other meaning from this identical passage than the very doctrine of Transubstantiation. I know, full well, that my learned friend is tacitly begging pardon of himself for having inadvertently alluded to it; I know that it is

the precise process going on in the mind of the learned gentleman at the present moment, knowing, as he well does, that I shall make him repent his temerity all the days of his life. [Laughter, when the chairman rose to order.] Justyn continues, "Nor do we take this as common bread and common drink; but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation, in the same manner we have been taught" (mark the word! ἐδιδάχθημεν is the original Greek), "we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the word which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, *is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.*" So have we been taught, says Justyn; but it requires scarcely any teaching at all to learn a doctrine, the simplicity of which is so obvious as the Protestant Sacrament; whereas it requires long instruction *from the stewards of the mysteries of God*, 1 Cor. iv. 1, to teach matters of doctrine involving mysteries and abstruse truths of any kind whatever, especially as it is written, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."—*St. Paul*, 1 Cor. ii. 14.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Is there no more in that passage of Justyn?

Mr. FRENCH.—No: that is the whole of it.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—But I have more; here is more. (Pointing to Justyn Martyr, open at the same page, and referring to the conclusion of the paragraph.) Hand over the book, if you please (to Mr. Finch) to Mr. French.

Mr. FRENCH.—But what part is it you wish me to come down to?

Rev. J. CUMMING. — Read the whole, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH — (reading the passage alluded to) — Well, but that does not come immediately after and join to it.

Rev. J. CUMMING. — If you read you will find that it does come after.

[Here a little interruption was occasioned by reason of some tittering on the part of the audience; but, order being restored, the learned gentleman continued.]

Mr. FRENCH. — I do not wish, my friends, to join things which are disjointed in themselves. However, as I shall never shrink from a fair and honest exposition of the truth, I am willing to read it. But first of all, let me say, though I have no objection to read the part pointed out by my learned friend, yet it deters and delays me from the matter. I want to prove Transubstantiation, and to which it has not the remotest connexion. You have evidently here, my friends, most clearly, in the words of Justyn (he is writing to the Emperor Antoninus), an exposition of our doctrine. He tells him that, after the words of consecration are pronounced, it is “the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus.” That is what the Catholic Church has taught, from age to age, in all her Catholic catechisms, in all parts of the world. “So we have been taught:”—*οὕτως ἐδιδάχθημεν*. This is the real Catholic doctrine, which is corroborated, instead of being subverted, by the passage which the learned gentleman has, with the utmost imprudence and impolicy, brought before you this evening. Now, therefore, I will read to you the passage, though coming after many lines downwards.

“Upon this we arise all together, and pour forth prayers; and, as we have said, bread is offered, and wine and water; and he who presides also

sends forth prayers and thanksgiving, and the people receive them with acclamation, crying out, Amen; and a distribution and communion of the consecrated things is made to every one present, and to the absent some is sent by the deacons. Upon this, those that are rich, and are so disposed, contribute each what he thinks proper, when the collection is placed in the hands of the president, who therewith assists the orphans and widows, and those who, on account of illness, or any other cause, are in a state of destitution; as also strangers and guests arriving from abroad; he is, generally speaking, the provider of all that are in want.”

“Now, most evidently this meeting alludes to the Sacrifice, and the collection made at the expiration of it, to the relief distributed to fellow-Christians in a state of indigence.” — *Justyn, Apol. I. pro Christianis*. Oxon. Grabe, p. 132.

It is well known that the Christians, in those days, were very poor; it was in the time of persecution, and the people were obliged to do every thing silently and by stealth, in order to avoid persecution of their assemblies, which were carried on in a very stealthy and secret manner. Even Pliny the younger, in that well-known letter which he writes to the Emperor Trajan, in which he informs him what the Christians did only sixty years (mark!) after Christ; he tells him “that, according to his (the emperor’s) wish, he caused the assemblies of the Christians to be pried into, and that he had found all very innocent; that nothing was going forward that he could report against them, except that there was one ‘*exitiabilis superstitio*’ — ‘one execrable, pernicious superstition,’ to which they were subject.” Now this certainly was not the participation simply of bread and wine in commemoration of our

Lord; no, but he evidently alluded to the ancient and apostolic dogma of the Catholic Church, namely, *the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. Such a dogma would, in Pagan estimation, as it does in Protestant, tally exactly with an "*exitiabilis superstitio*" — "an execrable superstition."

But as the learned gentleman has indulged himself with a passage from St. Justyn, I shall beg leave to please myself with another, a little more forcible, and somewhat more intelligible: — "Inflamed by the word of his calling, as it were by fire, truly we are the sacerdotal offspring of God; as he himself attests, saying, that in every place among the nations, '*We offer to him well-pleasing and clean victims.*' These victims he accepts from his own priests alone. Wherefore, showing preference to all those who, through his name, *offer the sacrifices which God ordained to be offered, that is, in the Eucharist of the bread and the chalice*, which, in all places of the earth, are celebrated by the Christian people, God declares that they are well pleasing to him. But the sacrifices of you Jews, and your priests, he rejects, saying, '*I will accept no offering from your hands, because, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, but ye have profaned it.*'" — (Malac. i. 10, 11.) — *Just. Dial. cum Tryphon. Judæo.* p. 209.

Once more, then, I most cordially and sincerely return thanks to my good-natured opponent, for reminding me of a passage in Justyn Martyr, which otherwise I might have omitted, and thereby essentially have injured the grand cause which I am this day engaged in advocating. For we have here, from a father of the earliest age, namely, A.D. 150, in words too

clear and cogent to be either misinterpreted or misunderstood, the fact stated, that, in the first place, the Eucharist is the real body and blood of our Lord; and, in the next place, we have that justly celebrated quotation, which is so familiar to most of the fathers—that celebrated passage from the prophet Malachi, applied to the great Catholic Sacrifice—a prophecy which the Catholic priesthood, in all languages spoken by the mouth of man, has ever resounded, from the very days of the apostles down to the present, as being continually verified and accomplished by the *unbloody sacrifice* of the Mass over the whole world.

Now, gentlemen, let me ask you, is this grand prophecy of the prophet Malachi to be totally annihilated, by referring it merely to the prayers offered up by Christians? Does it not plainly and positively imply that there was to be a sacrifice among the Gentiles? Were not prayers offered up in abundance by the faithful servants of God before the coming of Christ? And am I not adhering to the point (for I wish for once to rebut the charge of rambling in my arguments,) when I attempt to show that, from the very time of the apostles, there always has been an altar and a sacrifice, and always a priesthood, in all countries, faithfully ministering at that altar? Yes, it cannot be too frequently repeated, the Sacrifice of the Mass has always, since its first institution, been regularly offered up; the priest is nothing without the altar; and it is an anomaly in the history of the whole religious world, to have a priest without an altar and without a sacrifice.

My learned friend says, that I fight shy of St. Paul. Now that is the very ground on which I meet him, text for text. My learned

friend is not oracular, nor am I; but I shall beg leave to explain those texts according to my conception of their meaning. I will also bring a strong list of the early fathers of the Church to corroborate every word I say, in my way of interpretation, and he (my learned friend) will bring a few extracts from Calvin, from Beza, Zuinglius, and Luther, to substantiate his affirmations and positions. But that is not my object. I want no affirmation from living men, or from men so recent as those first reformers, concerning the doctrines of primitive antiquity. I shall content myself with laying open the sources before. When he can accomplish that, when he can turn over a large volume with facility, as I can, and show father after father, in every age, vying with one another in expressing, in the clearest manner, and in the most distinctive terms, the doctrine of the Eucharist, and the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as I can do, then it will be high time for him to talk of what he has described so beautifully, by "*a retreat on my part*;" but, until then, I stand to my ground untouched and unshaken, holding my head triumphantly aloft, looking down upon the puny despisers of our holy fathers in the same contemptuous style as that with which they attempt to look down upon such illustrious testimony.

And now, as I pledged myself to prove in the beginning that the actual words for the celebration of Mass were to be found in a passage in the New Testament, I will make my word good. I quote from the Acts of the Apostles, xiii. 2—"And as they ministered ("they"—the apostles) to the Lord," &c. Here, I acknowledge, that, according to the English translation, there is not a vestige of the word Mass

in these words "*as they ministered to the Lord.*" But I do maintain most strenuously, and I defy any learned man to contradict the assertion, that *λειτουργία* means "a sacrifice," and that it has been used so in all ecclesiastical antiquity. That the Greek Church, who celebrate the Mass in the Greek language, use it, and have ever used it since the days of the apostles, precisely in the same manner, and they express "to sacrifice" by the word *λειτουργία*. And moreover, I must inform my friend, though I know the signification will be contradicted, as it usually is by Protestants, that the learned Erasmus translates the passage in question, namely, *λειτουργούντων δε αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ*, precisely in the same manner, "*Domino sacrificium facientibus*—whilst they were making the sacrifice to the Lord." Accordingly, you find the Liturgy or Mass celebrated in all languages. There is the Syrian Mass, there is the Armenian Mass, there is the Greek Mass, and several other Masses, in which, although the ceremonies differ, each of those nations calls it the Sacrifice of the Mass, or the Liturgy. But as to the Greeks, it is, I contend, one of the most confounding arguments in the world to the Protestant clamourer against the Sacrifice of the Mass, that the Greek successive priesthood, who have never ceased to say the Mass from the days of the apostles down to the present time, still say that Mass in pure ancient Greek, and have no other word for that Mass but *λειτουργία*—the substantive of the very word used by St. Luke in the Gospel, namely, *λειτουργεῖν*. You have, therefore, as evidently as the sun shining at noon day, the apostles *saying Mass* in the New Testament:—*λειτουργούντων δε αὐτῶν κυρίῳ*: "Whilst they

were offering the Sacrifice to the Lord."

My reverend friend has alluded to some prayers in the Mass which could not have been used in the time of St. Paul. My learned friend must have attended very little to our doctrine, or to the words that escaped me, if he imagines that I asserted that every thing in the Mass, from beginning to end, was to be found in apostolical times. That was not my meaning, for many a prayer has been added to the Mass that was not there originally. All that we maintain is, that certain prayers, pervading the *liturgies* or *masses* of all languages, are most incontrovertibly of apostolical origin, and that those said pregnant, vital, vivifying words constitute the genuine Mass. When I am asked whether the Nicene Creed was there originally, my answer is, the substance in all probability was, the creed itself not, could not have been in the Mass originally, since it was composed 325 years after Christ: how, therefore, could it have existed in writing in apostolic days?

Archbishop Wake, arguing much more candidly and fairly than my learned friend is inclined to do, says that "the substance of these liturgies is all the same."

There is no other Greek word for Mass but *λειτουργία*! so all tradition hands down; and I do impress upon my learned opponent that it means among the Greeks, to this day, the Sacrifice of the "Mass," and nothing else whatever; and moreover, that at the fatal destruction of the eastern empire, when the Grecian priests came to Rome about the year 1418, they said Mass (*την λειτουργίαν*) and it has been continued to be said ever since by the Grecian priests at Rome, who there now say it; and the only word for Mass, which they still know, in the

Greek language, I contend, is that *ever-Protestant-confounding* word, *λειτουργία*. Besides, it is ridiculous to suppose that Erasmus, the first scholar of the whole world, since the revival of literature, would have translated *λειτουργούντων* by *sacrificing*, had it been a disputable interpretation. We have, therefore, actually, as I have demonstrated to you, we have the word, "sacrificing, or saying Mass," in the New Testament—a book which my learned friend most pertinaciously tells you that I shrink from. On the contrary, I will take this opportunity of telling him, once for all, there is no one book in which I so much glory, for the purpose of proving the tenets of the Catholic faith, which is "*the pillar and the ground of truth*," therein so conspicuously erected.

Akin to this charge of my recoiling, with a species of sensitive horror, from the pages of the Bible, as my opponent most evidently does from those of the anti-Protestant fathers, is his bold assertion, that the priesthood over Christendom was, at any one period of the Church, universally corrupted.

There never was a time, my friends (and mark me well whilst I point out this fact), there never was a time, according to the testimony of the Protestant ecclesiastical historians, when there were not men of the most eminent sanctity and virtue, adorning the Catholic Church. This is a fact which may most undeniably be proved by reference to successive ages of the Church. You will find, that during the lapse of ages, if you only open the writings of your own Protestant historians, that you can show no sanctity of heart, no purity of morals on the earth—no men earnest and unre-mitted in their endeavours to diffuse the truths, and inculcate the solemn

duties of Christianity, but by pointing to some of our Roman Catholic saints. But I go further, and say, that there never was one single age of the Church unilluminated by brilliant displays of piety and virtue in every part of Christendom; and that, during the time that some, branded for every vice that can sully the human character, were occupying important stations in the Catholic Church, still were there thousands upon thousands of holy saints, dwelling in the cells of the anchorites, or in monasteries, or moving in the walks of a guilty, contaminated world, who were estranged alike to all its vices, as to its lawful pleasures; men consecrating all the days of their life to the glory of their God, and destitute of all relish for any other species of delight than that of meditation on their celestial country. Yes, there were ever to be found numbers of holy men and women, in every age, ready and eager to lay down their lives to maintain their attachment to Christ Jesus their Lord, whom they adored with all the purity and sanctity of angelic beings.

But to reproach us, as Catholics, with the crimes of statesmen, is iniquitous in the extreme. It has nothing to do with tenets, with our articles of faith. If my catechism tells me that persecution is lawful, in that case I must applaud a Calvin even when burning a Servetus at the stake! [Symptoms of disapprobation on the Protestant part of the audience.] If persecution were lawful, according to my catechism, then I must applaud John Knox, and all those fiery vagabonds [renewed disapprobation, when the chairman rose to order] who went about Scotland throwing down our Catholic altars, and trampling on our crucifixes, which, at least, ought to have commanded some respect, as

emblems and inanimate representations of our Saviour, Christ. Was that, my friends, the spirit of piety and devotion?—and, since ye compel me to digress by your murmurs, did it not rather resemble the wild and ungovernable transports of the sanguinary enthusiast, than the calm and heavenly zeal of the heaven-aspiring Christian? But I should never have introduced such a matter into a theological discussion, had it not been previously referred to by my friend. The whole of the Christian religion is at an end, if such arguments are to be permitted for a moment. What! the Pagan might say (if reasoning by such analogy be lawful), do you pretend to tell me the Christ was God, when there was such an infamous, unhallowed, and nefarious wretch among his chosen apostles, as Judas Iscariot? Such a mode of reasoning, my friends, attacks the vital, the fundamental truths of Christianity.

Away with it, then! Let us adhere to close and solid argument. Away, I say, with such impotent reproaches! If we are to come to reproaches, look at your penal enactments against the Catholics, in the reign of Elizabeth; look at the sanguinary execution of males and females during the reign of Elizabeth—at the hanging of them up like common felons, and disembowelling them while yet alive. Look at the well-recorded fact which Dr. Lingard has painted in so true and so masterly a manner, that, “notwithstanding the indefensible cruelties of Queen Mary’s reign, there were actually more Catholics put to death in the days of Queen Elizabeth than Protestants in the reign of Queen Mary.” And upon this point a sharp literary contest ensued between the *Edinburgh Review* and Dr. Lingard, in which Dr. Lingard came off triumphant, with laurels

now uncontested even by the reviewers themselves.

But what, I ask again, has political persecution to do with my religion? Let me, since my learned and reverend friend dwells so pleasingly on these irrelevant facts, let me call your attention, my friends, to the well-attested and accredited fact, to be met with in the pages of Lingard, namely, that when the misguided Mary was putting to death poor inoffensive Protestants (and a shuddering idea it is!)—when she was, day after day, breaking the laws of her God, and violating the principles of the Catholic faith, a Spanish friar, who had come over in the embassy, and who had learned the English language, mounted with “the undaunted firmness of a son of Scotia,” (if I may use a simile capable of pleasing my reverend opponent,) mounted the pulpit in St. Paul’s church, and preached a memorable sermon to the people of England, to the effect that nothing could be more contrary to the vital spirit of the Christian religion than to persecute for differences of opinion. “It is not a doctrine,” says he, “of the Catholic religion. You are contaminating your souls—you are polluting your hands with innocent blood!” But statesmen, my friends, if permitted, or connived at by the people, as unfortunately history proves with too much clearness, will persecute in all ages. The Catholic, however, or the Protestant—let us extend the same justice to both—will then only be chargeable with it, when it becomes a fundamental article either of the Catholic or of the Protestant religion.

I have been led into this digression by my learned friend, and I do acknowledge that it never ought to have been mingled with a polemical discussion. The fault is not mine;

and, if I may tell my reverend friend what I think on the subject, such reasoning argues (in my humble opinion) more of the gall of human nature than of the sweet milk that flows from genuine Christianity. [Applause on the part of the Catholics, when the chairman rose to order.]

To resume. The Sacrifice of the Mass, my friends, is to be proved from St. Paul:—“Flee,” exclaims the apostle of the Gentiles, “flee from idolatry! I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is any thing? or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God, and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.”

There, my friends, I see that sacred table, to which I approach myself, as also my fellow-Catholics; I see therein that same table; I see the contradistinction between the altars of the Catholic, and “the altars of devils,” described by St. Paul. They have been seen from the time that Paul wrote (as the learned and eloquent Dr. Lingard has so luminously demonstrated); and in every part of the world there has been an altar erected, and a priest offering sacrifice at that altar. I see clearly that altar which my reverend friend does not; I see it

(if he will only permit me to judge for myself)—I see in this very passage (exercising my own free will, with which my kind friend endows me most kindly and liberally, whilst he sighs most charitably to emancipate me from the yoke of my priesthood—using, I say, the eyes of my own understanding)—I see that there is a sacrifice to be kept up in the Christian temple, very distinct from those sacrifices which he has told you are intended in this particular passage. It is not the bloody sacrifice offered up on the cross: for the fathers speak, in consonance with the prophet Malachi, of a sacrifice offered by the Church in every place, instituted, as they say, by our blessed Saviour at his last supper; pronouncing also, that it is performed by the priest at the altar, in the celebration of the Eucharist particularly. Nor do the fathers of the Church deem the victim here *symbolical*; they deem it to be the Son of God, the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world; and that he is here immolated, again, *unbloodily*, by the *priest*, God's power and omnipotence concurring, and angels wondering and adoring. What could be expressed more clearly to signify what it is that we receive? How can the universality of this propitiatory, unbloody sacrifice of the whole Christian world be more demonstrably established, than by their writings, according as they do with the constant, uninterrupted usage of the Catholic Church, added to the usage of those schismatic churches that separated from her (what can never be too frequently repeated) now nearly fourteen hundred years ago?

Contemplating, therefore, the Catholic Church thus believing, thus practising, thus teaching, in all ages since the days of the apostles, shall it be in the power, let me

ask, of the puny, the unlearned, the unstable, the arrogant dogmatizers, whether Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, or sectarians of any denomination, to overshadow by their clouds of darkness, raised up in the nineteenth century, the grand oblation and unbloody Sacrifice, wherein the Victim is and will be, by consecration, perpetually made present, under the species of bread and wine, until the consummation of the world; unless the testimony of the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of Truth, is to be rejected, when resounding through the mouth of his prophet, Malachi? No, my friends, believe me, neither the storms of heresy on earth, nor the gates of hell, shall ever prevail against the Church, whose principal act and obligation is the Sacrifice of the Mass.

We see, also, in many other passages of Holy Writ, besides the prophet Malachi, the most distinct of its predictors—we see reference to our holy Sacrifice of the Mass. These, probably, have escaped the discerning eye of my learned friend. I shall, therefore, beg leave to read them to him. I quote from Revelations, v. 6. (Douay version):—

“And I saw in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the seniors, a lamb, standing as it were slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent into all the earth.—7. And he came and received the book out of the right hand of him that sat in the throne.—8. And when he had opened the book, the four beasts, and the four-and-twenty seniors, fell before the lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.—9. And they sang a new canticle, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; because thou wast slain,

and hast redeemed us to God, in thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.—10. And hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign upon the earth.”

Some imagine that this, and especially many of the fathers of the Church, is descriptive of the true priesthood here on earth, prostrate at the foot of our holiest altars; and I candidly own (if my reverend friend, who declares that he is no priest, will permit me to judge for myself) that I firmly believe it has such reference.

My rev. friend has told you, with unceasing repetition, that I shrink from St. Paul and the Gospels. This, my friends, is not the case. I expected to have heard, and am rather waiting to hear from him, certain passages from St. Paul, to which he will direct your attention, and to which I will give a most satisfactory answer, when he shall have brought them forward. As it is, I shall merely say, in anticipation, that there are many passages in St. Paul, as St. Peter has expressed it, “hard to be understood,” hard of understanding, and which the unenlightened or unstable “wrest to their own damnation.” Now, really, if there be any danger of incurring damnation by twisting and distorting passages in St. Paul, how, I ask, can a Christian, who wishes to proceed in a sure, a safe, and direct way to salvation, how can he do better than by asking himself or others, how have all the holy men that have adorned the Church of God from age to age, how have they been accustomed to interpret certain passages hard of explication? Is it not much the safer way to go along with the stream of the constant, equably-flowing, and harmonious authority from age to age, than to follow the new-fangled doctrines of

the present day, when every man is his own interpreter on texts of so momentous a nature, that the salvation of an immortal soul is at stake, in interpreting them rightly or wrongly? How am I to know, when the learned gentleman quotes a passage from St. Paul, which is not of an obvious meaning, how am I to know that the meaning which he attaches to it is the correct one? Believe me, my friends, it is a dangerous, a perilous thing to go against the opinion and practice of all antiquity. I came into this room, if I may repeat words which I have before uttered, with records drawn from the archives of antiquity, in order to give my learned opponent an opportunity of confuting them and dashing them to pieces. But he has not been able to do so. And though he may say, again and again, without the least proof, that I am not friendly to the pages of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Luke, and St. John, yet he himself has already acknowledged, without the necessity of any proof on my part, that he does not like to open those sacred liturgies to investigate their origin; in one word, that he would rather not say anything at all about them, excepting it be this, namely, that one page of St. Paul, in his view of the subject, is worth ten thousand of them.

Now, without meaning to make my learned friend to start indignant from his chair, I will as boldly maintain, that one page of St. Paul may be more detrimental to the self-taught, self-confiding Christian, than the joint opinion of the unanimously-according fathers. And why? Because I am told by St. Peter, that some parts of St. Paul are, by readers of such a description, liable to be *wrested to their damnation, no prophecy of Scripture being of private interpretation.* But, in the books of

the fathers, I find them telling us what the Church has taught and preached in all ages; I find them concurring with the Bible, not (mark you, my friends) contradicting the Bible. God forbid that I should speak disparagingly of St. Paul. In a Catholic point of view, every passage in St. Paul is, as we maintain, perfectly harmonious and intelligible. We all acknowledge, that where St. Paul lays down, in language which is obvious to every one, any thing of Christian doctrine, we are bound then to look upon his words, thus engraven in the inspired volume, as being beyond all value. But I maintain that it is safer to be guided in the way to salvation by asking what the Church of ages has taught on difficult passages in the Bible, whether from the pen of St. Paul or St. Peter, or any one of the sacred writers, than to set oneself up for an infallible oracle, after the supercilious manner of my Calvinistic opponent, who takes up passages of the sacred volume, and gives an exposition as if he were actually possessed of all the intellect, all the acumen, all the wisdom of antiquity, superabundantly improved by modernism—discriminating every thing at first glance, and pronouncing, definitively, *ex cathedra superbiæ suæ*, from the proud chair in which he sits by self-instalment.

Tertullian has been adduced, by my learned friend, as an authority against our Sacrifice. I grant that Tertullian, in the passage to which he alluded, is not so specific on the point as other fathers of the Church; but I deny that the passage which he has brought forward militates against us in any shape or form whatever. On the other hand, I cannot omit this opportunity of observing, that my learned opponent views our doctrine with a grossly carnal eye. He never will, I fear,

understand, and it seems I cannot impress upon him, by any attempt at inculcation, that our Sacrifice, though containing, according to our tenet, the real body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, is still a “*spiritual*” sacrifice; which if he understood clearly, he could not fail to see that the word “*spiritual*” perfectly corresponds with the passage which he has quoted. But, in other places, Tertullian uses the word *offerre* (*to offer*) too significantly to admit of the least doubt as to its being our grand Sacrifice of the Mass, predicted by the prophet Malachi:—“We offer Sacrifice for the safety of the emperor to our God, who is also his.”—*Tertul. Lib. ad Scap. c. 2.*

Did Tertullian, let me ask, when he wrote these lines, imagine that the Roman emperor could collect from them, that *offering sacrifices for any one* meant merely *saying prayers for him*? Could the Roman language, as understood by my learned friend, be by any means accommodated to so figurative an interpretation in the understanding of a *Pagan*?

Can anything, then, be more clearly shown, my friends, than the truth of my position? My learned opponent unbraided me, on the last occasion when we met, by making a most ridiculous and unfounded assertion—that I never took a text of Scripture to defend my position, but that *that* text was sure to contain some pungent proof against our doctrine. I accuse my reverend opponent, much more warrantably, of just the same thing, not only from Scripture, but from the fathers.

I have not time sufficient to answer the wandering speech of my learned friend, for which my best excuse is, its want of anything like solidity, and having myself a great deal of solid matter to advance. But

I, in my turn (for I am not in the habit of putting questions of inanity), before I sit down, must call upon my reverend opponent, again and again, most importunately, and shall make it a point to reiterate it unweariedly, till this discussion is ended, to account satisfactorily for this extraordinary fact, viz. that the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered up by the Eutychians and Nestorians (who separated from us in the fifth century) at the present day; to answer, I say, how is it that the ceremony, perfectly analogous to our own, is still existent among them, namely, the unbloody, propitiatory sacrifice, by the priest at the altar? Is not that a circumstance worth looking at in the face by my learned friend, instead of—I will not say shrinking like a Scottish Highlander, for they generally face their enemies—but I will say, instead of in a dark, winding, Calvinistic manner, shrinking from such a strong, such a powerful argument, when it is wielded against him by one who knows how to hurl it, and to follow it up with a pertinacity not to be conquered? St. Augustine, the most faithful witness, *fidelissimus testis*, of all antiquity, as Calvin describes him, tells us that Mass was offered up for the repose of the soul of his mother, Monica. Will the learned gentleman attempt to impugn his veracity? or, with his usual oblivious rapidity in speaking, when he rises to address you, pass over the fact, as if it had never been attested, or had never been presented to his notice?

[The learned gentleman's hour here terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—There are two ways in which an opponent finds it somewhat difficult to reply to the statements of his adversary who has

preceded him. I confess that if the speech of my learned antagonist had been replete with lucid and admirable argument, that then I should have felt a course of reply open and fairly before me; in the arguments there might be difficulty, but in the line of reply there could be none. But my opponent's speech, from its beginning to its close, has been nothing else than a sort of incantatory effort to conjure up the airy ghost of Transubstantiation, instead of a series of sober and intelligent arguments in defence of the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, the subject under discussion. It really does perplex me how to reply, so that we may each maintain our common credit with this assembly for adhering to the question which we proposed, viz. the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. My learned antagonist brought forward a number of statements, calling upon me to show when the Mass was introduced into the Christian Church. I showed you a time, posterior to the apostolic age, when it *did not exist*. This I proved by an extract from Justyn Martyr, which was brought forward in reference to Transubstantiation on a preceding evening, from which it is clear, that in his day, and according to his testimony, and *prior to the existence of those so-called ancient Liturgies*, out of which my antagonist has quoted, there was no such thing as the propitiatory Sacrifice or ceremonial of the Mass; and to this triumphant fact he has made no reply. *Let it then be recorded, that in the second century Justyn Martyr knew nothing of the Mass propitiatory Sacrifice.* An elaborate statement of my learned friend was rather a concession than otherwise—for this I heartily thank him. He exclaims, how absurd it is for me to call on him to prove that this propitiatory Sacrifice exists in the Bible, *when it*

did not exist till three centuries after! That is just what I want—he has deliberately, or inadvertently, conceded that it is not in the Bible, but that it sprang up subsequently. I have taken down the words of my learned antagonist; he most certainly said, how ridiculous it is for me to call on him to prove that such a thing existed in the Bible, when we find that it existed only three centuries after! If the learned gentleman thinks he spoke inadvertently, I will allow him to withdraw it. [To Mr. French, and laughter.] Another remark of his was, that we Protestants have no priest and no altar; for his part, he could not conceive the existence of an altar without a priest, or a priest without an altar, and he added, with apparent satisfaction, that we have neither. No mistake can be more gross. It is true that we have no material or perishable altar, which “the moth and the rust may consume,” and which the ruthless invader may defile and overturn; but we have an *altar* which the unclean have no right to approach, and a *sacrifice* which none are able to destroy. We have a priest as well as an altar. We have a priest, not like the priests of the Church of Rome, liable to all the passions and imperfections of humanity, one succeeding to the other by reason of death, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins; but we have “a Great High-priest that is passed into the heavens,” who ONCE FOR ALL offered sacrifice for sin, and who now sitteth at the Father’s right hand to make intercession for us. Christ is at once our Altar, our Sacrifice, and our Priest.

If we have not the sacrifice, the altar, and the priesthood of Rome, we have those of Christ, and all in Christ. We have an altar of far

nobler material, a priesthood of more glorious attributes, and a sacrifice so consummate and so perfect, that it needed to be offered but *once for all*, and no more, to the end of the world. My learned antagonist has performed many splendid gyrations round and round St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews; but the moment he came too near the exterminating records of the apostle, he dashed off *instantly* to Tertullian or Augustine, or to some other renowned and illustrious father. I know why Mr. French has said so much *about* St. Paul, and so little *from* St. Paul; he knows there is a rod in pickle for him from that quarter [laughter]; he knows what St. Paul states, and he knows still further, that if the statements of St. Paul are to be recognised as binding and final, the Mass, with all its superstition and absurdities, must be exploded, and driven before those inspired statements, like chaff before the wind, on the threshing-floor of summer. To vindicate his remaining at so respectful a distance from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and having as little as possible to do with Scripture, he quoted from the two epistles of St. Peter, “in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned wrest to their destruction.”

Now, when I come to the Rule of Faith, I am prepared to canvass this reference at large, but I would remind my antagonist, that in the original it is *εν οἷς*, or the neuter gender, and not *εν αις*, the feminine gender. The words or relative “*in which* there are some hard things,” he states does not refer to “*Epistles*,” but to *things* spoken of in the Epistles. Now, even the fact, that in the days of St. Peter certain unlearned persons wrested the Scriptures, is proof positive

that these persons were not under the interdicts of the Church of Rome, else how could they wrest what they were not allowed to read? The cure, moreover, prescribed by the apostle is in the last verse:—"But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ," *i.e.* read more and more the Bible, and you will be less likely to misunderstand it. "The unlearned wrested them to their own destruction," that is, the uninitiated, the undrilled; those who snatch at fragments of Scripture hère and there, without looking to the analogy of truth or at parallel passages, and to the whole harmony of inspiration—who imitate the conduct of my opponent, taking isolated fragments, as was manifested so palpably when he quoted from Revelations:—"Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us priests unto God;" and inferred, in a style of logic for which he should take out a patent, that there are sacrificing priests in the Church of Rome. Why, who is it that are nere made "priests unto God?" It is the laity as well as clergy in heaven. The whole Church says, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us in his blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, be glory and honour." They are priests, just as St. Peter told the laity in his day:—"Ye are kings and priests." In order to meet another allegation of my learned antagonist, I must recur to Justyn Martyr, though really I am sorry to bring you into this interminable forest of the fathers, where one father knocks his head against another father, and another father knocks his head against both, and with whom Roman Catholics play at seek and hide. Nevertheless, for the sake of my learned antagonist,

who is so passionately attached to the fathers, and correspondently afraid of the apostles, I will read from his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho.

Let us see, if in this extract from Justyn, he does read of any other sacrifices as offered up by Christians, save spiritual praises, prayers, &c. My antagonist states, that his priests offer up "a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead—a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice." Justyn Martyr says, on the contrary, "I also affirm that the *prayers and praises of the saints are the only perfect sacrifices acceptable to God.*" (τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐαρεστοὶ εἰσι τῷ θεῷ θυσίαι.)

"For these only have the Christians undertaken to perform, and by the commemoration of the wet and dry food, in which we call to mind the sufferings which the God of gods suffered through Him whose name the high priests and scribes have caused to be profaned and blasphemed through the earth."—*Dialog. with the Jew Trypho*, p. 345. Paris, 1515.

I next quote another passage from the same father, showing that he has a far greater spice of Protestantism than my friend is prepared to anticipate. My learned antagonist appealed, in one of his less timid moments, to the Bible, and quoted from the Roman Catholic version, (Acts of the Apostles xiii. 2,) "As they were ministering" to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them, &c.

This passage, which to every unprejudiced ear savours so little of Transubstantiation, or its idol-infant, the Mass, is actually adduced by my learned friend, with his eyes open, as a proof of the Mass.

Really, I never met with an adversary who had so happy a knack of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers. [Laughter]. He has

actually brought forward this text to support the Mass! "whilst they were ministering to the Lord," that is, says my opponent, offering up the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ.

Mr. FRENCH.—"Ministering" is the word.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Yes, "ministering," and as you expounded it, "offering up the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God." And the learned gentleman endeavours to drive home his position by referring to Parkhurst's Lexicon, which I have on the table. I will refer to it also. When my opponent quoted from the Lexicon, I called to him to *read on*, but he felt it more convenient and desirable, as on previous occasions, *not to read on*. I will read the remainder of the passage for his edification. Parkhurst defines *λειτουργέω* to minister publicly in sacred offices. The Lexicographer then quotes from Josephus those who ministered according to the Jewish service, and adds, "*in works of charity*." Is this the Mass? My learned friend left out the clause, *in works of charity*, and gave merely it was "whilst they were ministering" according to the Jewish service. This slip is curious. My learned opponent contends that the Greek verb *λειτουργέω* means to offer propitiatory sacrifice, or to offer up the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God. Now follow me, and see to what results this interpretation leads, and you will witness again what I told you at the outset, that a full refutation of a Roman Catholic's argument may be found in the very texts which are taken up for his defence.

I refer you to the fifteenth chapter and twenty-seventh verse (I quote from the Douay Bible) of the Epistle to the Romans:—"For if the

Gentiles have been made partakers of these spiritual things, they ought also in carnal things to *minister* to them." The Greek is—*εν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς*. The same verb, *λειτουργέω*, is used here as in Acts xiii. 2, which my opponent says means *offering up propitiatory sacrifice*. The meaning, therefore, of this verse in Romans xv. 27, would be, that as the Gentiles received spiritual things, then that they ought also in carnal things to offer up to them the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass in return. Observe: he says *λειτουργέω* means to offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass, then I contend that such a reciprocity as this interpretation necessarily entails, is of a most extraordinary stamp, since, for the reception of spiritual blessings for the Jews, they were in return to offer up the propitiatory Sacrifice of "the Mass, the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God!" Strange recompense, and still stranger transition on the part of the apostle, if my opponent's whimsical interpretation be right.

I quote from Hebrews i. 14 (Douay version):—"Are angels not all *ministering* spirits sent to minister for them?" The Greek word in this passage is the same as in Acts xiii. 2, which means, according to my friend's interpretation, offering up the Mass. We must contend, therefore, that *angels* offer up the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. If the word *λειτουργουντων*, in the Acts of the Apostles, rendered in the Roman Catholic version, whilst they were "*ministering* to the Lord," means really whilst they were sacrificing the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God, then I demand a reason [to Mr. French] why I am not to assert, by parity of reasoning, when it is declared that angels are *ministering*

spirits (the same word λειτουργικά) that angels offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass : it is the very same Greek word that is used as in the Acts ; angels, therefore, are sacrificing priests, and to saints, not to God, they offer up the body of Christ a propitiatory sacrifice. I must come to this conclusion, if the interpretation of λειτουργέω, in Acts xiii. 2, by my opponent be correct.

Again, in Romans xiii. 6, we read, that "rulers" or kings are the "ministers of God." The Greek word is λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν—the very same word employed in the Acts, and therefore, of course, according to my opponent's process of interpretation, "rulers offer the Sacrifice of the Mass." It is the same word ; I refer my opponent to the passage. I find the very same Greek word, which Mr. French says means to offer propitiatory sacrifice, applied to angels, to rulers, and to priests ; and therefore the inference unquestionably must be, *if* the second verse of the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles means, "whilst they were saying Mass," then when we read, "angels are ministering spirits," we are to understand angels say or offer up Mass ; that when we read "rulers are ministers of God," that it means, they say Mass for God ; and that when we read, "Gentiles received from the Jews spiritual blessings," by an admirable species of reciprocity, they are to offer to the Jews, in return, the Sacrifice of the Mass. This, mind you, is not *my* private interpretation ; but, pursuing the interpretation adopted by my learned antagonist, I am inevitably led to the conclusion, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is to be offered up by kings, and rulers, and angels, and priests, if the Greek verb λειτουργέω means offering propitiatory sacrifice.

If it means so in Acts, and nowhere else, I ask an explanation ; I know my opponent is a Greek scholar, and competent to judge of the right meaning of the passage, and he must know, if he will be ingenuous, that it means "engaged in the service of God," or "ministering publicly in the sacred office," or "in the assembly of God's people."

This interpretation of my opponent is, he knows, absurd, and he dare not risk his reputation for scholarship on such a position. But I proceed to better matter. I have two positions in reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass—positions which I deduce *from* the claims of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Let me, however, preface my arguments by an important distinction. We call *prayer* a sacrifice, but not propitiatory ; we call *praise* a sacrifice, but not propitiatory ; but the distinctive name for the Sacrifice of the Mass, is "A PROPITIATORY, A PROPER AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE FOR THE SINS OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD." It will, of course, be admitted on all sides, that there are two great *pre-requisites* to constitute a "propitiatory sacrifice." The first is the *destruction of, or death of the victim* ; or, in other words, *the shedding of blood*. Now, the apostle Paul says expressly, "WITHOUT SHEDDING OF BLOOD THERE IS NO REMISSION OF SINS;" in other words, in every propitiatory sacrifice the victim must be destroyed. The lamb that was offered was slain ; the goat was slain that was offered in sacrifice ; and in every propitiatory sacrifice the *death* of the victim is a *sine qua non*. But in the Mass, according to all Roman interpretation, there is NO DEATH OF THE VICTIM. *Christ does not suffer death in the Mass*. It therefore follows that there is no "propitiatory sacrifice" in the Mass.

I repeat this decisive argument. According to the Bible, the destruction of the victim is essential to a *propitiatory* sacrifice. Heb. ix. 22 :—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," "without the destruction of the victim there is no *propitiatory* sacrifice;" but in the Mass there is no such destruction as my opponent allows; and therefore, there is no *propitiatory* sacrifice in the Mass. I take up the words more strictly: "WITHOUT SHEDDING OF BLOOD," says the apostle, "THERE IS NO REMISSION OF SINS;" but did not my learned antagonist maintain, what Dr. Doyle, in his Catechism, also maintains—that the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice? has he not shown us, from authentic documents, that his own Church says so? But the apostle says, "*without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins,*" and therefore, the inference undoubtedly must be, that as there is no shedding of blood in the Mass, "there is no remission of sins," and the hope of Roman Catholics is an awful delusion! "The Mass is *not* a propitiatory sacrifice." Or if he maintains that there is *shedding of blood in the Mass*—or, in other words, suffering of death—in bold defiance of the declaration of Dr. Doyle and the oracular statements of his Church, then I say that the priests of the Church of Rome take up the dreadful conduct and crime of the Jews and Roman soldiery at the cross; they crucify afresh; they shed again the blood of the Son of God. On the one or other horn of this dilemma I impale my learned adversary, and call upon him to extricate himself how he best may. "Without shedding of blood," says the apostle, "there is no remission of sins;" but *in the Mass* there is no shedding of blood, and consequently, in the Sacrifice of the Mass,

there is no remission—there is no propitiation for sin. In the next place, there must be not only these pre-requisites for every *propitiatory* sacrifice, viz. the destruction of the victim, or the shedding of its blood, but there must of necessity be a suitable and *valid* priesthood also.

The Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice. To offer it up, there must of necessity be a sacrificing priest. We contend, no such functions are ascribed to the ministers of the Gospel in the New Testament. There are in the Greek language two distinct words, both of which have been rendered priest :—*ιερεύς* and *πρεσβύτερος*. The former applied to the priests of Levi, and descriptive of sacrificing priests—the latter applied to the ministers of the Gospel in the New Testament, and denoting no function peculiar to a sacrificer. The word *priest* in the Book of Common Prayer, is derived from the Greek *πρεσβύτερος*; German, *prester*; French, *prêtre*; English, *priest*. My position, which I call on my antagonist to disprove, is, that there is no passage in the New Testament in which any minister of Christianity is, in contradistinction to the faithful, described as either a *ιερεύς*, or sacrificing priest. If no *ιερεύς* among the New Testament ministers, then is there no propitiatory sacrifice to be offered. I therefore call on Mr. French to lay his finger on *one solitary passage* which declares that Christ left behind him in his Church an order of sacrificing priests, or invested his ministers with names or functions denoting them possessors of power to make propitiatory offerings. All believers constituted in the New Testament are a glorious *βασιλειον ιεράτευμα*—kingly priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices of thanksgiving and praise. Every Christian layman is as much a *ιερεύς* as his minister. Every believer in

this assembly is a *priest* unto God. No minister, Protestant or Roman Catholic, is so exclusively and distinctively.

"Ye also, as lively stones" it is 2 Peter chap. v. [to Mr. F.] "are built up a spiritual house, an holy *priesthood*, to offer up *spiritual* sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." "I beseech you, by the mercy of God, that ye present your *bodies* as *living* sacrifices." Now, then, I repeat my statement, that the words *presbyteros*, *episcopus*, and *diaconus*, are the words used in the New Testament, to describe the ministers of Christ, and there is not an officer in the New Testament Church distinguished from the body of the faithful by the name of *ιερεύς*, or "sacrificing priest;" and I therefore tell the reverend gentlemen who sit beside Mr. French [the Rev. T. Sisk, of the Roman Catholic Chapel, Chelsea, who, with another priest, was present on the preceding and subsequent evenings] that he is no sacrificing priest [Mr. Sisk bowed] in the sense in which he holds it. Mr. French is as much a *ιερεύς* as he. I should rejoice to hail him as coadjutor in the Gospel of Christ; but, to enable me to do so, he must abjure the fearful assumption of any power to bring from heaven and immolate upon his altar the Lord of glory. There is no *ιερεύς* in this room separate from the whole body of the faithful, save that High-priest, that Great High-priest, who said to all his followers, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

We read in Hebrews, v. 4, "No man taketh this honour unto himself" (that is, "the honour" of being a sacrificing priest, as the context will show you), "but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Now I have shown you that God has not called, or appointed, any to

be sacrificing priests; and in the New Testament Church there is not one solitary passage, from the *Alpha* of Matthew to the *Omega* of Revelations, in which the minister of Christ is described as officially and exclusively a *ιερεύς*, or "sacrificing priest."

MR. FRENCH. — What was the text?

REV. J. CUMMING. — The text I last quoted was Hebrews v. 4. Let us look at the institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 26), and see if there is any intimation of a sacrifice, or sacrificing priesthood, there:—"As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *show* the Lord's death till he come." The words are not, ye do offer up "the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ till he come." The Lord's Supper, therefore, is an institution to show forth the death of Christ "till he come," not intended to perpetuate the offering up the "body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God." When our Lord was instituting the communion, it is recorded in the twenty-second of Luke, that "he took bread, and gave it to them, saying, 'This is my body, which is given for you.'" Now the Mass is a "propitiatory sacrifice," or *something offered by the priest to God*, but here is something given BY GOD TO US; or in a sacrifice something is offered by man to God, but a sacrament is something given by God to man. When our Lord instituted the Eucharist, we read of *no altar*, on which was to be offered up his body and blood, soul and divinity — *no sacrificial* priest; we find no intimation that there was propitiation made in the Last Supper by our Lord, or that he asserted that the Eucharist was henceforth to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. If the Last Supper

was the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, I ask why did he offer himself again? If the Last Supper was the sacrifice that satisfied High Heaven and saved lost mankind, what means the fearful and agonizing cry—"Father! if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, but nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done?" If the sacrifice was made when the Last Supper was instituted, then must we blasphemously infer from this fact, that the last sacrifice of Christ on "the accursed tree" was a work of supererogation, uncalled for and unnecessary. But if the Last Supper was what we believe it to be—an affecting *symbol* of that solemn and momentous sacrifice, a *symbol* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, about to be offered up upon the cross, then we feel the absolute necessity of his last great sacrifice, because the truth is inscribed in the records of the Jewish economy, and re-echoed in the oracles of the church, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin"—and, "The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin." God himself must suffer, bleed, and die, before the guilty sinner could be redeemed.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, vii. 23, you will find the following important truth:—"They truly," the priests of Levi, under the law, "were *many* priests" (and the same necessity of reason applies to the *soi disant* priests of Rome), "because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this Man, because he continueth ever, hath an *unchangeable* priesthood." Now—

Mr. FRENCH.—The reference, if you please.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Hebrews vii. 23, 24. You observe, there were "many priests" under the law—"they were not suffered to continue

by reason of death;" but this priest, Christ, hath an *unchangeable* priesthood. The Church of Rome has rendered the word "*eternal*" priesthood; but I appeal to my friends whether the Greek word ἀπαράβατον, derived from α παραβαίνω, to pass over, compounded of παρα, beyond, and βαίνω, to go, does not mean a *priesthood that cannot pass from one to another*—a priesthood incommunicable and intransmissible, exclusive and peculiar. The Greek is explained in Parkhurst (Rose's edition):—"What passeth not from one to another," as the Jewish high priesthood did from the father to his son and successor. Theodoret explains it, ἀδιαδοχον. This epithet, ἀπαράβατον, denotes that Christ has an *incommunicable, intransferable* priesthood."

[Mr. French, appearing to deny it, and appealing to the Rev. Mr. Sisk.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—My friend, I perceive, doubts me!

Mr. FRENCH (in reply).—"A priesthood *that does not pass away*."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—The Greek word, I assert, from its composition, its definition in Parkhurst, and its synonyme in Theodoret, means what I have stated—*which passeth not from one to another*.

Mr. FRENCH, and another voice [which the reporter understood to be the Rev. Mr. Sisk's].—False! false! bad! bad! it is παρα and βαίνω—"that does not pass away."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Very well, as you choose. I have given you the original word and definition of the Lexicon, and I now leave it with every Greek scholar in this assembly to decide whether the word does not mean "*unchangeable*," or *that passeth not from one to another*, and not as the Roman Catholics now define it, that "cannot pass away." I am not at all surprised that my friend is obstinate on this point, and

contends strenuously for a *diluted meaning*, because if it be a characteristic of Christ that his priesthood is essentially and inseparably interwoven with his other sacred functions and glorious offices, and can no more be passed away from himself to another than his *omnipresence* or omnipotence can be transferred, the assumptions of the Roman priesthood are blasted by that epithet as by a thunderbolt, and the Mass proved a fabulous deceit. One reason of the perfection of his priesthood is, because he *continueth ever*. Observe, one peculiarity of Christ's priesthood is, it continueth ever. The feature in contrast with this, and characteristic of the Mosaic economy, is that the priesthood passed from one to another, that when one priest died another succeeded him; but Christ continueth ever. There is neither room nor necessity for any other priest; the completeness of his sacrifice, the fulness of his intercession, and the continuance of, and impassable origin of his functions, render other sacrificing priests unnecessary and inadmissible. Their assumptions are intrusory; their claims are blasphemy; their existence, an attempt to defeat the ends of the Gospel. We have all we can want in the complete and glorious priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I may mention that one of the fathers, to whom my learned friend has referred, expresses the Greek word ἀπαράβατον, by *having no successor*. We have an explanation from one of the fathers of this word confirmatory of ours, if that were needed. If this be the fact—and I am prepared with references abundant from the Greek and Scripture to show that that is the meaning—then Mr. French knows there is an *end* of the claims and proud assumptions of

the Roman Catholic priesthood; that their functions are gratuitous; that their office is unhallowed; their order derogatory to Christ and ruinous to men's souls. The ministers of the Gospel are not sacrificing priests in any sense different from the laity. Heb. vii. 26, 27:—"For such an High-priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; *who needeth not daily*; as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, *first for his own sins*, and then for the people's, for this he did *ONCE* when he offered up himself." The Greek word is ἐφάπαξ—*once for all*—perfectly, completely, not to be done again. I contend that if St. Paul had been professedly combating the doctrine of the Mass, he could not have used stronger or more exterminating language. He says, "We have not a High-priest *who needeth daily to offer up sacrifice*." But in the Church of Rome they have priests who need daily to offer up sacrifice. It is a fact, that at least 400,000,000 of masses have been offered up since the year 1801. A calculation below the mark, is that there may be about 30,000 priests in the world; suppose they offer a Mass a day, that will be 210,000 a week, and 10,920,000 a year, or, during the last ten years, in round numbers, 100,000,000, and during the portion of the century that is now expired, and by the same arithmetic, nearly 400,000,000 of masses. Monstrous! almost (I speak it with every kindness towards my antagonist) blasphemous statement! What is the language of St. Paul? "This he did *ONCE* for all." He needs not to offer up himself 400,000,000 of times, for "this he did *ONCE* for all." The apostle, drawing a contrast between the priesthood of Christ and the priests under the Jewish economy, or any

similar economy, says, "he needeth not daily, as did their priests, to offer up sacrifice for the sins of the people, for this he did *once for all*," when he offered himself as the victim on the cross. I implore you to read the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and if ever there was a splendid and overpowering confutation of the doctrine of the Mass, it is contained in those four chapters, and you will find the word *ἀπαξ* repeated at least seven times—"once for all"—and this completeness of Christ's sacrifice and perfection of priesthood sweeps away for ever the claims of a sacrificing priest.

Again, I quote Heb. ix. 11:—"But Christ being come, an High-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in *ONCE* into the holy place"—*ONCE FOR ALL*, you observe, never to come out again to be sacrificed on the altar, "*having obtained ETERNAL REDEMPTION FOR US*," and, therefore, no need of any other sacrifice to be added, as if our redemption could be exhausted and die, or to make more satisfactory and complete, than that which is eternal.

Again, I read from the same chapter (Heb. ix.), verses 13, 14:—"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God!" Now, in this passage we find—

Mr. FRENCH.—The reference, if you please.

[The reason of these interrup-

tions on Mr. French's part was, that Mr. Cumming was obliged to make the quotations so rapidly, on account of the shortness of his time, that it was almost impossible correctly to record them without having the references again stated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I quoted from Heb. ix. 13, 14. Now, then, you observe, I am not giving my own private interpretation—I am laying the Mass and Scripture side by side, that you may deliberately see if this propitiatory sacrifice is a doctrine that enjoys the patronage of the apostle St. Paul. "Through the Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot or blemish." Here Christ is at once the ALTAR, and the VICTIM, and the PRIEST. His Godhead was the *altar* that sanctified and sustained the majestic offering; his humanity—his "spotless" humanity—was the *victim*; and the Lord Jesus Christ was the great High-priest. He offered himself, the victim, on the *altar* of his Godhead.

Again, in verse 22:—"Almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission." I have told you that in the Mass there is no shedding of blood, that it is, by the definition of Dr. Doyle, an "unbloody" sacrifice; and, therefore, this statement at once exterminates its pretension to be a propitiatory offering for the sins of the living and the dead.

The twenty-fifth verse of the same ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews:—"Nor yet that he should *offer* himself *OFTEN*, as the High-priest entereth into the holy place *every year* with blood of others." Now, mark, it is not required that Christ should *offer* himself *OFTEN*; but, in the Church of Rome, (as my learned antagonist can testify,) it is required that Christ offer himself

often by the priest. Yes, four hundred million of times during the last forty years. The Bible says it is NOT REQUIRED that he should offer himself OFTEN, but the Church of Rome says it is REQUIRED that he should offer himself OFTEN. [Turning to Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—Yes.

REV. J. CUMMING.—The learned gentleman most candidly acquiesces. All I need add is, that the Church of Rome, in the pride of her folly, says *one* thing, and St. Paul, the inspired penman, says *another*! Do you admit the inspirations of St. Paul's Epistle? Do you hold it to be the word of God?

[An intimation of assent from Mr. French.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—Then I call upon the learned gentleman, when he stands up, to reconcile these two extraordinary facts—the apostle says, *it is not* necessary that Christ should *often* offer up himself; the Church of Rome says *it is* necessary. I anticipate every possible reply, and remind this assembly of an extinguisher on such opposition:—“*Let God be true, though every man a liar.*”

I read on to the twenty-seventh verse of this chapter, and quote the words; “for then *must he often have suffered*, since the foundation of the world; but now *ONCE*, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” The apostle has just said, “It is not necessary that he should offer himself *often*.” Why? (I specially call your attention to this.) “It is not necessary,” says the apostle, “that he should OFFER himself OFTEN.” He assigns the reason: “*because* then must HE OFTEN HAVE SUFFERED.” In other words, the apostle says, every time that Christ is OFFERED he MUST SUFFER; and mark! if he has been

“*offered often*” on Roman Catholic altars, he must have *often suffered*” at the hands of Roman Catholic priests. The Church of Rome disclaims, I believe, the idea that Christ undergoes any suffering in the Sacrifice of the Mass. But if she disclaim the idea that he suffers, she must also disclaim the opinion that he is offered on her altars. But if Christ be *often offered*, he must, according to the inspired declaration of the apostle, *often suffer*; if the Church of Rome maintains he does *not often suffer*, I must infer with St. Paul, he is *not often offered*, and therefore, that the Mass is, in the words of the Church of England, “a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.” It must be so, my Roman Catholic hearers, if the words of the true God are truth; and, oh! I implore you, my deeply deluded fellow-countrymen, and you, my learned opponent, to weigh these solemn and eternal statements, for we must each give an account before the judgment bar of God of what we have said and heard this evening! I implore you, my Roman Catholic friends, while I see many intelligent and inquiring countenances around me, to lay these sentiments seriously to heart, and resolve this night to receive or to reject the doctrine of the Mass, according to the verdict of this infallible tribunal. This holy volume must root up every plant that is not of our Father's planting. Revere, receive its records.

I turn to Heb. ix. 27, 28:—“And it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the *judgment*. So Christ was *once offered* to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.” Is there anything between man's dying and the judgment? “No,” says the apostle, “as a man *once* dies, and cannot

be expected to die twice, and then comes the judgment, so Christ was **ONCE** offered, and then comes a second time." The next event is his second coming, and not a frequent or daily offering before it. The parallel is complete; it is beautifully rendered in the Douay version:—"So Christ, once offered, **EXHAUSTED** the sins of many." Our version has, to "bear the sins of many." The next personal event that falls to man after death is judgment; and the next personal event that follows our Lord's having offered himself once is his second advent, *there being recognised no intermediate offering.*

I quote Hebrews x. 12:—"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can *never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.* For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins." The apostle says, that "*sacrifices offered from year to year, continually, can never make the comers thereunto perfect.*" But the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass in the Church of Rome is *often offered*, year by year, continually; nay, so often, that, as I have told you, within the last forty years only, it has been offered at least four hundred million times. Therefore, they cannot possibly procure that full, finished, and perfect salvation which must be obtained by the soul before it can enter into glory. Sacrifices often offered are not propitiatory enough, and cannot take away sin. But the Mass sacrifice is often offered, and therefore it cannot be propitiatory enough.

I go to Heb. x. 10:—"By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus,

ONCE FOR ALL." The Greek word here is *ἐφάπαξ*—**ONCE FOR ALL.** Now observe, to repeat this oblation is to declare that it has not "*sanctified once for all*;" in other words, to repeat the sacrifice of Christ is to declare it to be imperfect. If it need to be repeated, it follows that we are not "*sanctified*" once for all; that the sacrifice of Christ was not the perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice which it has been described to be. I will quote here from the Douay Bible (as I am willing to do on all these texts, there being little difference), Heb. xi. 11:—"Every priest standeth daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this Man offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God."

"For by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

You observe the contrast between the priests of the old dispensation with Christ our great High-priest: "*They*" (the priests) "*were standing in the temple daily, ministering,*" just as they (the priests) do in the Church of Rome, "*offering often the same sacrifices,*" as the priests do in the Church of Rome; **BUT** this Man offered *one sacrifice for ever*, so that such priests and offerings are done with. He "*sitteth at the right hand of God.*" You observe, he does not come down to the Mass-house to be sacrificed on the altar of the church of Rome by the priest; but he ever sitteth at the right hand of God, having offered up one finished sacrifice for all. "*For, by ONE OFFERING or oblation, he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.*" This goes like a ploughshare through the Mass and its ministering priests.

My dear friends, let me call on you earnestly to weigh these solemn truths. First, "*without shedding*

of blood there is *no* remission;" but in the Mass there is *no* "shedding of blood," and, consequently, "*no* remission." Secondly, that without the destruction of the victim *there is no propitiatory sacrifice*; but in the Sacrifice of the Mass there is *no* destruction of the victim. "Christ dieth *no more*;" and, therefore, there is *no propitiatory sacrifice*. In the next place, the apostle contrasts "*many priests*" with *one priest*, *many sacrifices* with one great sacrifice—one *once for all* oblation, by which "we are perfected and sanctified," with those many and daily-repeated oblations which can never take away sin. And, therefore, I do contend that all those passages from the reputed ancient liturgies and fathers, among whom my learned friend has so frequently rambled, and from which he has brought every sort of heterogeneous and irrelevant extract, go for nothing in comparison of what St. Paul declares; and I do call upon him now, earnestly and honestly, to apply himself to the investigation of these sacred passages, and to reconcile them with the doctrine of the Mass, as it is defined in the canons of the Council of Trent, or in the Catechism of Dr. Doyle.

Let me, in a few words, entreat your attention to the glorious sufficiency and completeness of our sacrifice. When God forgives the sinner, and remits the sins of the guilty penitent, he does it *once* and for ever. He forgives as God. It has been related of Alexander the Great, that on his desiring a person to ask what he pleased, and it would be given him; and on the person asking a paltry and valueless boon, Alexander said, "It may be becoming in you to ask this, but it is not in me to give it—when I give, I give like a king." Our Great High-priest "*gives like a king*," and his

gift is as lasting as it is munificent; perfect salvation, nothing less or *more*, is bestowed; free, full, and final pardon is the royal boon of our Melchisedec—there is no reason why it should not be so. The holiness of God, so pure that it detects imperfections in angels, folly in the bright cherubim, and stains in heaven, is infinitely glorified in that sacrifice. Justice, unbending in the least as in the loftiest of her demands, that before wrote in characters of fearful and mysterious import, "Tekel, thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting;" on our every thought and deed, and caste of our race, is met and magnified. The truth of God—that announced with the immutability of heaven's own oracles, "the soul that sinneth it shall die"—looks on the tragedy of Calvary, and finds its threatenings therein exhausted; and God himself proclaims from the opening heavens, with a parent's piercing and melting love, "Why will ye die, O House of Israel; turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die?" It is within the sacred precincts of Calvary, and around the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, that "mercy and truth are met together, and righteousness and peace have kissed each other," and a reconciled Father, by reason of this once-for-all sacrifice, looks down from heaven on his reconciled and ransomed family, saying, "These are my sons;" and they look up from the scenes of reconciliation, once the scenes of estrangement, and say, in ecstatic and glorious accents, "*Abba*, our Father and our God." The Church of Rome leads her victims to believe that God is a hard and tyrannic taskmaster, shorn of all a father's benevolence, something like Pharaoh of old, who called on the people to make bricks when they had no

straw—neither to be propitiated by victims, nor to be melted by prayer. So inexorable is God represented in Roman Catholic theology, that the body and blood, soul and divinity of his Son must be offered up to him four hundred millions of times during the last forty years [a voice, “forty-five years”]. But God is not a hard taskmaster. He says, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;” and all who appear in that Son before God, clothed with his perfect righteousness, and with raiment washed in the blood of the Lamb, is fully and for ever accepted of God. This is not all. The salvation of a Romanist’s soul rests on the merest contingencies. The *intention* of the priest is essential to the sacrifice. If your priest be an infidel and deceives, you may be adoring, with supreme worship, mere flour and water, instead of God, and risking your soul on a piece of paste, instead of the only sacrifice for sin. This is not all. The liabilities in the *De Defectibus Missæ* place every Roman Catholic’s salvation at the mercy or the honesty of his baker, his wine merchant, and his priest; and, if any of these deceive—the Roman Catholic—be astonished, O Heaven! and wonder, O earth!—has NO SACRIFICE. What a precarious and perilous Church! Your poor souls repose on shifting sands. Your immortal spirits and your eternal destiny are cast into the laps of men and placed at their disposal. Far otherwise is it with the Protestant Church. We have an ALTAR, which no earthly contingency can contaminate or overturn; we have a PRIEST—a great High-priest—who loved us from the first to the last; “who ever liveth to make intercession for us.” We have a SACRIFICE, so perfect, so far beyond the reach of earth, or the revenge of

hell, that no wreck or ruin can remove it, and no admixture from above or below can defile it. Protestant Christianity is worthy of God. The Roman Catholic faith is unlike and unworthy of heaven, and unprofitable to earth. It is worse than salt that has lost its savour.

Suppose, when our first parents fell, and “brought death into the world, and all our woe”—suppose that there appeared on earth an immense enclosure, in which were found alike the dying and the dead all mingling—sin wasting and consuming the aged and the young—suppose that Mercy, smitten with compassion at the miserable scene, came down from heaven, to ascertain how all might be restored. Three sentinels are seen at the gates of this vast enclosure—Justice, Holiness, and Truth. Mercy, in touching accents, asks of them, “Can you not open the gates and let the captive be free, the diseased be whole, and the dead breathe heaven’s air and love?” Truth says, “I have written, ‘The soul that sinneth, it shall die;’ and what is written is written, and cannot shrink.” Holiness replies:—“Without holiness none shall see the Lord, and I may not give way.” Justice adds, “These are all weighed in the balances, and found wanting; the gate must remain eternally barred; the dead must moulder—the dying must die.” Mercy, with agony, asks, “What must be done and suffered that will effect their deliverance?” Truth, Holiness, and Justice reply, “Either these SINNERS must die, or a sufficient SUBSTITUTE must die.” Mercy wings to heaven her flight, and with high sacredness proclaims the fact, and asks if any substitute can be found for the guilty. The Heavenly Father asks, “Whom shall I give?” and a voice is heard in this hour of

"dread alternative," — "Lo! I come. Here am I, send me." God's Eternal Son undertakes the work—engages to become man—as man to suffer, as God to satisfy. He assumes our nature, in the fulness of the times; he bleeds, he dies, and he is buried; he bursts the restraints of the tomb—rises triumphant over death, and presents himself, *Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar*, at the gates so sentinelled and so secure, and claims, once for all, the deliverance of all. Truth says, "I am satisfied; the soul that sinned has died." Justice exclaims, "I am satisfied;" Holiness adds, "I am magnified;" and Mercy triumphantly proclaims — "Then open wide the gates; let the redeemed rejoice, let the dead live, let the dying rise as heirs of glory! The Great God has borne the curse—the weeping and guilty world may lift its head and hail the blessing!" [Applause, and cries of "Order."] This is Protestantism. This is the good news. The everlasting doors *are* unbarred — no more sacrifices are now required to throw them open.

Protestantism finds its type in Abel, and Roman Catholicism its type in Cain:—Cain was the first Roman Catholic priest, and Abel the first Protestant. Cain, as we are told, brought "the loveliest flowers of the field," and these he wreathed as a garland round the shrine of God; and the first fruits of the golden Autumn, and these he laid as an offering on the altar of God. Abel, on the other hand, brought the firstlings of his flock, and shed the blood of a lamb in sacrifice to God. Cain's was an "unbloody" sacrifice — Abel's a bloody sacrifice. Abel's offering was acceptable—Cain's, to sense the more beautiful, was rejected. Why? Abel's was the confession of sin and the recognition of Christ.

Cain's, the disclaimer of sin, and disbelief in the necessity of Christ's death. When Cain offered his, he probably said, "O Lord, these flowers and these fruits, the productions of the earth, I consecrate to thee; they have received their beauty from thy smiles, their fragrance from thy breath, their being from thy power; I consecrate them to thee as a testimony that I acknowledge thee as the God that made me and provides for me." But Abel said, "I acknowledge *all* this. Thou art my Creator and Preserver; but more, I feel myself a guilty sinner, and that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. I immolate the lamb to show that I deserve to die. I acknowledge myself guilty, depraved; and my only trust is in that spotless Lamb, that glorious sacrifice, prefigured by this—slain from the foundation of the world, and to be offered in "the fulness of time," "once for all," for the sins of mankind.

In conclusion, I assure you, my dear Roman Catholic friends, I envy not your church, her gorgeous cathedrals, her splendid ceremonies, and her pompous ritual. Her sin is not the splendour of her worship. Her guilt is her concealment of truth. When Alexander the Great desired Diogenes to ask of him any favour, the cynic replied, "I have but one favour to entreat of your majesty, viz. that you would be pleased to stand aside from between me and the sun in the firmament, that it may warm me;" and in like manner I crave neither the riches, nor the power, nor the greatness of the Church of Rome; all I demand, and I demand it in the name of God, is, that she would stand aside, or withdraw the tinsel ceremonies wherewith she veils or extinguishes the truth, and allow me, and millions and millions more, to gaze on the

holy lustre of that Sun of Righteousness which shines resplendently in the firmament of heaven, whose presence is light, whose beams are immortality, whose smiles bear, as angel visitants, salvation to the cottages and cabins of the earth's population. My friends, I implore you not to let the truths of God fall upon your ears without their legitimate effect. Contrast, I beseech you, my statements with the oracles of God, and come to the deliberate resolve, that though a father should say, in tears, "it is cruel to leave me," and though a mother should say, "it is ungrateful to forsake me;" though all dear and delightful sympathies of life should centre and vibrate around that chord of affection that binds you to the Church of Rome, yet all must be renounced for truth—martyrdom must be met for truth. "If a man love father, or mother, or sister, or brother, more than me, he is not worthy of me." The Church of Rome bids you look to the miserable Mass—to torturing, but false purgatory,—to priestly absolution to a man—a wafer—a phantom refuge—to a helpless pope—to Transubstantiation; but PROTESTANTISM gathers

up and condenses her deep and glorious inspiration into one sacred text, and pours it forth in her own fervid and imperishable tones:—"BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, THAT TAKETH AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD!" [Loud and confused cries of "Beautiful! beautiful!" "Order! order!" which was followed by loud applause, and frequent hisses from different parts of the room.]

Order being restored, after an intimation from J. Kendal, Esq. the Catholic Chairman,

Mr. FRENCH rose and said—Gentlemen, I trust that the Catholics will abstain from anything of this kind, or from following the example of their Protestant brethren. I don't attempt to *preach*, myself. [Laughter.]

[The reverend gentleman's hour here terminated.]

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

REV. J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH, Esq.

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

FOURTH EVENING, THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1839.

SUBJECT :

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

(Continued.)

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and Gentlemen—I have to argue this evening with an opponent who is more eminently skilled, in my humble opinion, than any man I ever met with in my lifetime, in—I will not say in reasoning—but in discoursing upon conclusions, drawn from shadowy and

unsubstantial premises, and upon concessions which he affirms his adversary to have made, which concessions are the mere product of his own fertile and exuberant imagination—I say imagination, gentlemen, because I do not wish either to think or to say, that he has wilfully mis-

represented my words, or falsified my statements; but all I wish to inculcate is, that such is the strain and sweep of his imagination, when he is declaiming and oratorizing, in that fervent and impassioned manner in which you will soon hear him, that he actually persuades himself I have said what I did not say, and made concessions which would absolutely argue the utmost folly and imbecility in me to make.

Another specious artifice which I have to complain of in my learned friend is, that, towards the conclusion of his harangue generally, instead of using strong arguments to wind it up convincingly, he has recourse to what he calls (for I noted down the phrase) "the gathering up the glorious inspiration of Protestantism," but which I would call, in more sober language, a loose, confused, and tumultuous outpouring of text upon text, without any bearing whatever upon the subject. Now, by this he actually works upon the illiterate part of his audience in such a manner, he works them up to such a burning pitch of enthusiasm, as to make them forgetful of the solemn engagement to which they pledged themselves upon entering this room, viz. to preserve an inviolable silence, and not to exhibit any partiality, by the least acclamation or applause bestowed upon their favourite disputant. This is what I have to complain of with respect to my learned antagonist in the first place.

But I have other complaints of a more serious nature, to urge against him, and I think I had better do it in this open and unreserved manner, than calumniate him in private, and say behind his back that which I would not dare to utter in his presence. I do, therefore, contend that, in treating of the awful and tremendous mysteries of the Eucha-

rist, as we Catholics deem them to be, he continually uses the most unbeseeming and censurable expressions; that he wounds our feelings in a very acute and sensitive manner; in one word, that he is not justifiable before his God for such apparently malignant and wanton procedure. Many Catholic ladies and gentlemen who honoured me with their presence latterly will not attend these discussions any longer, in consequence of this his frequent and reiterated abuse of all that we deem holy in heaven and on earth. I declare, gentlemen, that for myself I would not speak in such a taunting, such a galling manner, even were I resident in the country where the Pagan religion is practised, if I saw its votaries really and fully persuaded of the rectitude and verity of their false and idolatrous religion. Yes, my friends, I confidently hope that I should never be so forgetful of the natural amplitude and expansion of my mind, as to descend to expressions that would tend to wound or to violate their religious feelings. If I saw a Mahometan proceed slowly and majestically in solemn procession to the shrine of Mecca, to pay his reverence at the tomb of Mahomet—whom I deem to have been an impostor, as well as you—still, God forbid, my Protestant brethren, that I should so far forget myself as to laugh at him scornfully and deridingly, or to use any expression, especially if I wanted to convert him, that would, in all probability, be productive of a contrary effect, namely, to alienate him for ever from the Christian religion. Such, however, is the *track* of wisdom pursued by my learned friend, imagining as he does, that I, not he, am wandering in the mists of error. He comes here, my friends, employing all the power of pathetic language to work upon your passions

and your feelings, in that artificial, theatrical manner, which he so well knows how to practise; he comes here and tells me, that he is panting for my salvation, that I am indulging in an idolatrous worship contrary to the authority of my God, and that he wishes to wean me from it. I am not now giving his literal words, nor have I penned them down; I am merely stating what is the general tendency of his expressions. Now, I reply to all this, that if he be really panting for my salvation; if he wishes to allure me into the pathway of reetitude, and to disabuse me of my errors, he should adopt a far different procedure. Such a mode of panting appears to me more like the panting of a vindictive Cain, when he rose upon his brother Abel, in pure envy of the acceptance of the sacrifice he offered, than of the calm, sympathetic tenderness of one who wishes sincerely for my welfare. I will not believe that a man is seriously intent upon my conversion, when he endeavours to shock and to hurt the best feelings of our common humanity by what I call a system of dark, malignant offence by sacrilege and blasphemy. I am not so uncharitable as to say, that he imagines himself before Almighty God to be guilty of sacrilege and blasphemy; but what I contend is, it sounds so in Catholic ears.

The question between us, the first question between us, was Transubstantiation; that is not entirely finished, inasmuch as it is necessarily involved in the present discussion of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The question is simply this:—We believe that, when the words of consecration are once pronounced, instead of being bread, it becomes really the body of our glorious Saviour Jesus Christ. He believes that no Transubstantiation takes

place, and that it is merely bread and wine. Still he calls it the *sacrament* of the Lord's Supper. Now, would it become me, talking of his sacrament, either here—talking of it as it is celebrated in your church or churches, where you are impressed with reverential feelings of awe during its reception—would it become me, as a Catholic, to laugh at you, or to use any expression unbecoming the imagined dignity of the occasion? No; were I to do so, I should charge myself with acting in a very wanton and reprehensible manner; or if I showed any levity of conduct, or indecorum in your churches, though I do not believe the sacrament to consist in what you conceive it to consist. Let me, therefore, expect the same return from my respected friend. I say this without any virulence [to Mr. Cumming, who acknowledged the admission by a bow], but it does appear to me to be totally indefensible in any man, in the course of disputation, to indulge his tongue in such unbounded licence. Another observation that my friend made, and it is one, it seems, which I have to answer as a kind of theological argument, was, that Cain was our first priest—Cain, the murderer of his brother Abel, the first Catholic, the first Catholic priest! Could anything, I ask, be more shocking, I will not say in the way of argument, but in the way of outrage upon our best feelings? But, gentlemen, rather in a good-natured than in an ill-natured manner, I will retort the compliment, and I will tell him that the priest Cain is “one of those dead weeds which he threw over from his garden into ours,” in the language of Swift. And why? Because there is a kind of intimate brotherhood subsisting between Cain and *Calvin*. They both protested against everything that was good

and holy. Cain and Calvin, in my humble opinion, were both of them loud protesters against the ever-living, existing, and ever-speaking voice of the true Church; they were both enemies to *true sacrifice*; the hands of both were stained with fraternal blood; therefore, there is a kind of brotherhood existing between them; they are a "*par nobile fratrum*." So that Cain is indisputably more a priest of the church of Calvin than of the church of Rome. But in the days, gentlemen (though I would rather return to the subject), in the days of Calvin, lived a renowned saint of our Church (whose life I would wish my reverend friend to refer to, for the name is familiar to most people versed in the literature of those days)—the great and illustrious Bishop of Geneva, St. Francis of Sales. Read the lives of these two men together, compare them together; the one, you will find, is the glorious essence of all that sweet-alluring piety that flows so visibly, so undeniably from our hallowed altars; the other, the very essence of all that rank virulence and gall, which is so observable even at the present day, after the lapse of three centuries, in every speech against the Catholic that issues from the mouth of one of his genuine disciples—I mean, a true son of the Scotch covenant.

In vain, my friends, on perusing the life of that renowned Catholic priest to which I am referring you, St. Francis of Sales, will you look for the least similitude to the gloomy, the vindictive, the sanguinary Cain; whereas, on reading the life of Calvin, one cannot but exclaim, that Cain himself, that monster of inexpiable guilt, might just with as good a grace have lifted up his hands at the altars of the immaculate Lamb, as Calvin

could have lifted up *his*, reeking as they were, *in the pure days of reformed Christianity*, with the blood of Servetus. But to quit this subject (and all the odium of introducing it lies upon my rev. opponent)—the learned gentleman tells me I evade his arguments and positions. I reply, it is not argument; it is mere idle declamation, that I scorn to notice. He tells me that he envies us not our gorgeous cathedrals, and our splendid vestments. I answer him—show me in that sacred Book, which you say is the foundation of every thing that is to be observed in Christian practice, show me in the pages of inspired Writ where the God of Heaven finds fault with man in pouring out the full tide of earthly magnificence and beauty, in order to decorate, to the utmost of his power, those majestic temples which human wisdom has erected to express, after its feeble manner, its deep sense and conviction of the *Divine*; show me, I say, where in the sacred volume mortal man is reprehended by the Deity for such a temerarious act; and especially show it in those parts where Jehovah points out, specifically and minutely, the particular ornaments that are to be used in the embellishment of Solomon's temple? Again, show me that such adornments were ever specifically abrogated by Jehovah, as being altogether unworthy the imitation of all after-ages (though inspired by Himself into the mind of Solomon); show me this, I say, and I throw away instantaneously all forms and ceremonies, all the proprieties of decorum and external splendour, in the celebration of divine service; nay, once prove to me that we are forbidden by the New Testament to employ the glories of the earth in extolling the name of Him who hath so magnifi-

cently clothed it, and I have no objection to see introduced into our temples that gloomy drapery which is so congenial to the frigid soul of the Scotch Calvinist.

The learned gentleman next accuses me, as if it were something at once unorthodox and criminal, of my fondness for the fathers; he charges me with clinging unrelinquishably to the fathers; and so it must be admitted I do; but why? Because, I answer, those fathers cling unrelinquishably to the *Bible*; they are always quoting, always explaining, always elucidating the *Bible*; and that is precisely what I want, instead of the nauseating, the mushroom wisdom of this boasted nineteenth century. I have said that I never will, during the course of this discussion, for one moment abandon the fathers, the glorious fathers of the Church; but, at the same time, I also claim, at least with reference to the adversaries of my church, full possession of the *Bible*, to interpret in my own manner. No, never let me be compelled to distort and "orientalize" its pages, just as my learned friend shall think proper. But to follow my rev. opponent as closely as I can in all his observations, whether of a connected or unconnected nature, he tells me, that in his view of things, he would rather have one Paul, than twenty thousand fathers! Now what say I, by way of reply? Why simply this—and I will utter it though the fanatics around me should burst with indignation whilst I do so—give me one solid, one authentic father, in preference to twenty thousand Pauls [murmurs in some parts of the audience]—mark me! not in the *abstract*, but in preference to twenty thousand Pauls *wrested* and *interpreted* by Calvin and his Calvinistic disciples. That is what I would say in answer to

my reverend friend; I say it with good nature, but with seriousness. I will tell him my opinion just as freely as he charges us with idolatry. In perfect good nature, and yet at the same time without the least deviation from the truth, I do declare that I consider the swarm of Calvinistic interpreters to be the most noxious, the most empoisoning, the deadliest swarm of commentators that ever brooded over the pages of the Gospel, and defiled its glories. If it were possible for me—and I say it not out of any antipathy to my learned friend—for he is a most ingenious and enviable man, as to the talents of his mind—I say it not out of any antipathy to him, but if it were possible (though its possibility I cannot conceive) for me to relinquish that faith which I profess, and to which I am so firmly wedded, not only by education, but by deep, intense, and laborious study—were I to go over to Protestantism, as in fond anticipation the learned gentleman has more than once insinuated, I candidly confess I would rather associate myself to the Church of England, with all its load of heresy upon it, than enter, for one contaminating moment, as a proselyte, the portals of the Church of Scotland.

But, my friends, among those glorious fathers, to whom I shall have to advert this day, there is one, I think, who ought to be entitled to some little respect in interpreting the *Bible*, if the learned gentleman has really any reverence for his great master and grandfather, Calvin. I think when Calvin tells him that St. Augustine, to use his own words, to be found in his "*Institutes*," and which I believe my learned friend will allow—when Calvin, I say, tells us that St. Augustine is *fidelissimus testis antiquitatis*, the most faithful witness of all antiquity, that, with-

out incurring the reprehension of my reverend opponent, I may be permitted this day to enter the spacious garden of the Scriptures, hand in hand with St. Augustine; and I beg leave also to express a hope at the same time, that the reverend gentleman will at length cease making use of the stale joke, that I ever fly most cautiously from Scripture ground; at all events, I would advise him to desist from such an accusation, when it must be evident to every one, that the very texts which I have been citing and dilating upon from that sacred book are still uppermost in his mind, and filling it with perplexity and confusion too visible in his countenance to need an interpreter. No, my friends, *λειτούργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν*, he well knows is not to be got over.

I fully intend, therefore, to open the pages of the Bible, but I *will* have St. Augustine by my side—that is all the liberty I crave. Now, gentlemen, I did mention, in the first place, that my learned opponent argued upon very shallow conclusions; that his conclusions were extremely taking and ingenious, but his premises very unsubstantial and shallow; and I likewise mentioned, that he put concessions into my mouth, which I never made, and which I solemnly declare to you I never did intend to make. My friend had the advantage of ending the discourse on the last night, when my mouth was completely closed, as it will be again this evening—the misfortune is on my side, I cannot help it. He, therefore, had the last word, and was pleased to entertain his own fancy with the idea, that my last address to you was destitute of *one single argument*. Mark that. However, I console myself by reflecting that I shall be perfectly rescued from that imputation when what I have said

appears upon paper. He will have the last word again to-night, and thereby I labour under very great disadvantage on a most important question—a disadvantage which I ought not to labour under, inasmuch as I am the aggressed and he is the aggressor. He came into this village to declaim against the Catholic religion, to point out its errors and superstitions. I took up the gauntlet and challenged him. He at first declined it, and afterwards accepted it, and threw down the gauntlet to me. I am not on the offensive; he is the aggressor. Did the present challenge originate from me? No, most decidedly not; it originated from him, and here I am, upon a most vital and momentous subject, condemned to let my learned and ingenious friend have the last word. That being the case, I shall make the most of my time. The concession which he says I made him, at which I was astonished, and which I shall be glad to explain, is, that I admitted that those liturgies (the verity and authenticity of which I established so firmly) were not coeval with the apostles, but were of a date some centuries afterwards. Now, I began by reading to you, from this book, the acknowledgment of the Protestant Archbishop Wake, and several other bishops, as to the liturgy of St. Mark, the Epistle of St. James, and other liturgies, showing you that they all agree on one point, viz. as to the substance of them being, indisputably, *penned by the apostles themselves*. How then, I ask, could I have been so stupid as to make such a concession? So far from making it, I consider (though it is by no means an article of Catholic faith) the liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, and the other liturgies, to be as authentic as the Gospel itself, and the words of St. James to be of

equal veracity and inspiration with those of St. Paul. I shall therefore read you the passage once more :—“It can hardly be doubted that those prayers (in the liturgies) in which they all agree, in sense at least, if not in words, *were first prescribed in the same or like terms, by those apostles and evangelists.*”—*Archbishop Wake on Apostolic Fathers*, p. 102.

The names, therefore, or titles affixed to the *liturgies*, are of little signification. Some of them, indeed, refer to the apostles who introduced the form of Christian worship in the churches where these liturgies were used. But what is of the highest consequence is, that the liturgies contain the common form and order of public worship observed in those churches, and, consequently, that they contain a public profession of the faith of all the clergy and people attached to them, in the ages in which these liturgies were in use.

The most sacred part of the form of divine worship, the *canon* (called the *Anaphora* in the oriental liturgies), during the first two or three centuries, was only committed to memory, and retained by the bishops and priests, as the Apostles' Creed was learnt and retained by the faithful.

The canon was not written till about the beginning of the fifth age, when the danger of exposing all that was most sacred in the mysteries of religion to the derision and blasphemy of infidels was not so great as it was in the first two or three centuries; but when the canon was generally committed to writing, it was to be found the same, in substance, in all Christian countries. This showed the unity of its origin in the unity of that faith which was everywhere taught by the apostles, and which was the spirit of the body and language of the liturgies.

I contend, therefore, most victoriously, that these liturgies will stand for ever as so many glorious, indestructibly monumental proofs of the truth of the Catholic religion, admitted, as they are, to be genuine by every truly learned and inquiring Protestant theologian. Yes, the authenticity of these liturgies remains unimpeached and uncontested by the sons of learning; and when I bring before you such a circumstantial, solid body of evidence, where they all agree as to grand points, viz. that it is the body and blood of Christ, an *unbloody victim*, an *unbloody sacrifice*, *την ἀναιμακτον θυσιαν του ιλασμου*; “*The unbloody sacrifice of propitiation* :”—when we have such an acknowledgment as this after the words of consecration have been pronounced,—have not I most gloriously vindicated myself from the concession which my reverend opponent, in the ductility of his imagination, persuades himself that I have made, to the effect that these liturgies were the product of after ages? No, my friends, I never made such a concession—a circumstance which will enable me, by the grace of God, to obtain an illustrious triumph over my learned antagonist. I now come to that word which seems so significative to my learned friend, and to which he manifests such a sensitive dislike.

I explained to you the words *λειτουργουντων δε αυτων*: “*Whilst they were celebrating Mass.*” My reverend friend would fain neutralize the efficacy of these words; he will not listen, in his decided hostility to their bearing, to any argument upon them, though I have Erasmus on my side, translating it in a similar manner; Erasmus, I say, the greatest scholar that ever adorned this country, for he was Regius Professor of Greek at Cam-

bridge, as my friend knows; who was the greatest scholar, of those at least illuminated with native genius, in any age since the Augustan; we have Erasmus, my friends, translating *sacrificantibus illis*.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Read Erasmus, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—I have it not with me. You can take it *pro confesso*, or deny it, just as you like; or I will give it to you the second time (*i.e.* next speech).

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I will take it the second time.

Mr. FRENCH.—Very well. But, my friends, I use still more convincing and satisfactory arguments. The Greek language has been cultivated, time immemorial, by the learned Greeks. Mass has been said among them from that time down to the present day. At Rome you can hear the Mass said in Greek, and you can hear it in the Greek islands said in Greek, and they can speak Greek, and they thoroughly understand their language, and they all call the Mass *λειτουργια*; they all call the act of celebrating Mass *το λειτουργειν*. Now, the very fact of these Greeks bearing testimony, and whole nations besides bearing testimony, that that was the word handed down in one continued stream of tradition, is perfectly sufficient to tell me what the word means without resorting to Greek lexicons. How do we know the position of the city of Rome, except by the harmonious consent of tradition? It is Rome, is it not? And you and I will concede to it, as our descendants will also, to have been the capital of the Roman empire to the end of time. Perhaps it may not be circumscribed exactly within the same bounds, but there is the spot, and no man in his senses ever doubted it. How do you know it? You know it by tradition, just as

you know other things, of a material and immaterial nature; and therefore my inference is, that *λειτουργια* means Mass by the same principle of reasoning, even on the supposition that I had no other ground to reason—such as, for instance, my own insight into the Greek language, backed as it is by that of men who are something more than a *magni nominis umbra*.

My reverend friend attempts to invalidate this irrefutable argument by showing me, that *λειτουργια* is sometimes used for *ministering*. I grant it; and so is the word *θυω*, which he will acknowledge means “to sacrifice,” and it is the same in English. For instance, if I say, “to sacrifice a victim,” there we have the word; but that does not hinder me using the word sacrifice in a figurative sense. Again, I may say, “You are sacrificing your own interests for the good of another,” as is often the case in common *par-lance*, but that does not take away the meaning of those plainly discernible words in the Acts, viz. “Whilst they were offering the sacrifice or celebrating the Mass.” No, my friends, there the sacramental words are staring you in the face; there they lie level to the capacity of every one. There is also the Mass in the liturgy of St. James; there is the Mass in all the other liturgies already alluded to and cited; there is the Mass in all the fathers of the Church, in every age; and still, notwithstanding all this irrefragable testimony, we are to be told by the unblushing declaimers of the nineteenth century, that the Mass is an invention of the *dark ages*!

Gentlemen, I have but one more allusion to make before I go to my remarks, though I am afraid I have wasted too much time already [the learned gentleman here paused to

inquire how much time remained, and finding he had but five-and twenty minutes, continued]. I shall preserve what I had intended to say on another subject till I have done. I shall therefore now come to very serious matter, and it is to answer a portion of the speech of my reverend friend, which was not, I candidly acknowledge, of so wandering or excursive a description as to that part of his address: I mean, where he alluded to the pages of the Bible, which he had in his hand, and in referring to which, I will do him the credit to say he adhered very closely to the question. I collected from the notes which I have taken—for I was willing not to touch upon Scripture (which he seemed to think I shrank from), before I knew what he had to say on Scripture, pertaining to the subject we are discussing, and how differently he would interpret that Scripture from all the fathers of the Church with whom I was conversant.—I wanted to know, moreover, what was the ingenious mode by which the *unstable* in the nineteenth century, “*wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction*”—for you will recollect, my friends, that my reverend opponent was very unwilling, in quoting St. Peter, where he alludes to those who *wrest St. Paul’s Epistles* (as they do all other parts) “to their own damnation”—my reverend friend, I say, was unwilling, or perhaps forgot to mention, in repeating the text, the word *unstable*; for he knew very well I did not mean to call him unlearned—what I meant to bring home to him was, that the instability there implied cannot by the tongue of man be made applicable to the rock of ages, the everlasting Church, whose interpretations have been heard in one uniform tenor, from age to age, so as to rescue their followers from

all imputation on the ground of fickleness or inconstancy.

And now, the first remark of my reverend opponent that presents itself to my notice is, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is “a vain and idolatrous thing, ruinous to souls, and dishonourable to God,” to use his own words and definition, which escaped him, I think, on two or three occasions. “Dishonourable to God,” he says. Why? Because in Christ’s sacrifice God is sufficiently satisfied, and the repenting sinner fully secured. This he endeavours to substantiate by the text of St. Paul to the Hebrews:—“But this Man, after he had offered one sacrifice, for ever sat down at the right hand of God.”

Now, you will remark, my friends, before I enter into close combat with him, that this mode of interpreting this chapter, and indeed the whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is quite novel in the Christian world. I ask him (*i. e.* Mr. Cumming) and I ask you, my Protestant friends, where is the plausibility of this ingenious mode of interpreting the Bible and St. Paul’s Epistles, against the current of all antiquity in the Catholic church? It was never either used, thought of, or hinted at in the early centuries; no, not even in the twelfth century; there was not even a vestige of it! I certainly should like to hear a satisfactory answer to that. Surely it cannot be, that, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the people but began, and then only, to acquire an understanding of Scripture? It will, no doubt, be told me, that the laity could not get hold of them so easily. Why, the art of printing was not then invented—that is one reason; but surely there must have been some person, during the long tract of those innumerable days, who could not fail, either by the

help of a capacity equal to that of my learned friend, or who had assistance from heaven, in reward of piety equal to his own, to find out the genuine interpretation. I say, therefore, that if this argument proves anything, that is, "that this Man, after he had offered one sacrifice, for ever, sat down at the right hand of God;" if this argument proves anything, that binds me to the *letter*, not the *spirit* of them; it proves likewise, that both Christ's mediation in heaven, as well as the sacrifice which he has provided on earth, are also nugatory and useless. You must see the drift of my argument—if the mere circumstance of his dying is to satisfy entirely, and nothing more is to be done; if we are not to apply the fruits of his death to our souls, the blood of his sacrifice to our souls, by the different means of sacrifice and prayer, and spotless living, and other means pointed out in the Bible—I say it destroys Christ's mediation in heaven. What need of his mediation in heaven, what need of these instrumentalities on earth, if all is to be satisfied, sanctified, and appeased by his mere dying on the cross? For, listen, my friends, I beseech you, most attentively, to the testimony of this new-sprung light, that in the sixteenth century was miraculously shed around St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, by Calvin, the murderer of Servetus—a light, which appeared not in any age before, and consequently is not to be found in the pages of the fathers.

God is sufficiently satisfied, my reverend opponent contends; it is completed—all is finished—our ransom is fully paid by Christ's sacrifice offered on the cross. Now, then, if that be the case, I reply, it does away with prayer (which my opponent, by-the-by, calls the

sacrifice pointed out by *Malachi*), with the laws of self-denial—nay, with keeping the commandments; all these may, therefore, give place to the lusts of the world, and the evils by which we are beset; so that, without any effort on our parts, calmly, placidly, and uninterruptedly, we may all repose with full confidence upon the sacrifice of the cross; and yet, all the virtues above specified, my reverend friend will, no doubt, most willingly acknowledge are very profitable to us; nay, he cannot deny that they are ordained by God, as a means to apply to us the fruits of that bloody sacrifice, which we acknowledge with him was only to be offered *once*, *εφ'απαξ*, by which bloody sacrifice alone, I say, by which alone we are redeemed and renewed, and by which alone the Divine justice is fully satisfied and appeased. But what I contend is, with all antiquity on my side, that the sacrifice of Christ offering himself on the altar, in an unbloody manner, for the same end, is of apostolic transmission, and consequently cannot but coincide and harmonize with the bloody sacrifice of the cross, instead of being at variance and in a state of collision with it; yes, my friends, it must necessarily be, having been thus transmitted to us, a means instituted by Christ himself, whereby to apply the efficacy of it to our souls most sweetly and most exuberantly. Instead, therefore, of being idolatrous, or a vain and idle thing, dishonourable to God, as my reverend antagonist has designated it, I retort, in language as plain and unceremonious as that which he has used towards me, that it is blasphemy in any one who thus characterizes the grand sacrifice pointed out by the prophet *Malachi*, whereby the baptized *Gentiles* of every age down to the present day have never ceased

to apply to their souls the fruits of that bloody sacrifice, which, in his infinite love for man, Christ Jesus, our adorable Redeemer, offered on Mount Calvary.

But what, you may say, if this be so, is St. Paul alluding to in this memorable chapter? Why, simply, my friends, to the grand sacrifice of the cross, in contradistinction to the sacrifices of the Jews, and not one jot further. No instruction whatever was intended, as common sense informs us at the first glance, as to future Christian rites and usages, to persons who had not yet entered the very threshold of Christianity.

But, on the other hand, mark, my friends, "Because he is a priest according to the order of Melchisedek." He offers himself up for us daily in an *unbloody* manner, according to the liturgies of St. James, and according to all the liturgies of the Church, and not dissonantly and discordantly from the pages of the Bible, but most conspiringly with them, offers himself, namely, in the sacrifice of the altar, according to the glorious prophecy of Malachi:—"Daily in all parts of the world he offers himself up for us." And why? In order that we may apply the fruits of his bloody sacrifice on the cross to our souls, just as you say it can be applied by prayer and alms, and other virtuous deeds. But my learned adversary asks, How can he be verily present on our altars? Why, precisely in the same manner that he was present to St. Paul, journeying to Damascus. How did St. Paul hear from him? Did he not appear to him going from Damascus? If the words are taken in their literality, as signifying that as he had once ascended into heaven, that he is never to appear upon earth, how could he appear to St. Paul in journeying to Damascus?

But let the great St. Chrysostom be the instructor of my learned friend, instead of Calvin, in answering this question—no bad exchange. by-the-bye—[laughter]—St. Chrysostom says—"He has ordained a sacred rite, changing the victim, and, in the place of animals, commanding himself to be immolated."—*Hom.* 24, in *1 Cor.* t. x. p. 213.

"*This sacrifice is a copy of that; the offering is the same.* Not one on one day, and on the next another, but *always the same.* Thus, then, the sacrifice is one. But are there many Christs, as the offering is made in many places? By no means; it is the same Christ everywhere; here entire, and there entire; one body, as then; though offered in many places there is one body, and not many bodies: *so is there one sacrifice.* He is our priest, who offered the victim of our expiation; that victim we now offer was then offered, which cannot be consumed. This is done in remembrance of what was done. "*Do this in remembrance of me.*"—*Hom.* 17, c. 9, *Ep. ad Hebr.* tom. 12, p. 168.

Again, in proof that St. Chrysostom is speaking of the real unbloody sacrifice, and not any thing such as the oriental imagination of my rev. friend would be willing to suggest, he says—"The works that lie before us are not the effects of mortal power. He who once wrought them at that memorable supper—it is he himself who ~~now~~ performs them. We, indeed, stand as his ministers; but it is he himself that sanctifies and transmutes them."—*Ad Pop. Antioch.* tom. ii. p. 3.

And here remember, my friends, I do not mean by this line of argument to defraud Jesus Christ of his high-priesthood. They, the priests that consecrate, are but as ministers under the *ιεραρχος*—the Great High-priest. It is he who, according

to St. Chrysostom, and the other fathers, is alone the author of the ever-renewed miracle. The priest is but the lowly instrument. "The priest stands, performing his office, and pronouncing those words:— 'But the power and the grace are the power and the grace of God.' He says—'*This is my body*,' and these words change the whole *order* (μεταρρυθμίζει) of the things that lie before us."—*St. Chrys. ibid.*

St. Augustine—who is so much admired by the founder of Calvinism—has a passage, in allusion to the Jewish sacrifices—those types of sacred antiquity—which to a mind not totally inflexible to argument will appear at once decisive of the question, viz. Whether the Eucharist is to be considered as *the body of our Lord*, or merely as the *figure of his body*. The words of the saint are, and never have they been more appropriately, or more opportunely quoted:—"Sacrificium et oblationem noluisti, ait Psalmus Deo; antiqui enim, quando adhuc *sacrificium verum quod fideles norunt* figuris prænuntiabatur, celebrabant figuras futuræ rei. Sacrificia ergo illa tanquam verba promissiva ablata sunt: Quid est quod datum est completivum? *Corpus quod nōstis*, quod non omnes nōstis; quod utinam qui nōstis omnes non ad judicium noveritis!"—*Edit. Bened. St. August. tom. iv. p. 334.*

"'Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire,' said the Psalmist to God. For the ancients, when as yet *the true sacrifice* which the faithful are acquainted with was foretold in figures, celebrated the type of what was to come. Those sacrifices, therefore, signifying promises, were annulled. And what was given as *completory* of those promises? Why, *that body which ye know*, which all of you do not know"—meaning the catechumeni—persons, through

youth, or other causes, not yet initiated, "and which it might be wished that not any might know to their own condemnation!" There, my friends, is an astounding passage from Calvin's *most faithful witness of all antiquity*, for my learned opponent to digest; in the mean time, let me exclaim with the Benedictine editors of the works of that glorious father: "Locus pro veritate corporis Christi insignis!" That is, "a most conspicuous passage, in corroboration of the truth of Christ's body in the sacrament."

So taught all sound antiquity, but the very reverse is taught by hollow modernism! But *how* can this be? How can it become the real body of Christ Jesus? St. Chrysostom shall be again, for a few moments longer, the orthodox instructor of my learned friend—for he has told you, very truly, that when I am upon Scripture I am fond of introducing the fathers. He ought to be fond, and proud likewise, of the same filial deference to such illustrious predecessors, unless he prefers modernism to antiquity [laughter] in striking out the light that is contained in that inspired volume. St. Chrysostom writes:—*Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἠλίας μὴλωτην ἀφῆκε τῷ μαθητῷ ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνων τὴν σάρκα ἡμῖν κατέλιπε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ. Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἠλίας ἀποδυσάμενος ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς καὶ ἡμῖν κατέλιπε, καὶ ἔχων αὐτὴν ἀνῆλθε:—* "Elias left his garment to his disciple; but the Son of God, ascending, left unto us his own flesh. Elias, indeed, stripped himself of his covering, but Christ, ascending, took with him his body, and left it also for us."—*St. Chrys. Hom. 3, ad Pop. Antioch, tom. ii. p. 34.*

Again: "Reflect, O mortal, what kind of a sacrifice you are about to touch—to what kind of a table you are about to approach! Oh, meditate

profoundly, that, being nothing but earth and ashes, you participate of the body and blood of Christ!"—*Id.* p. 384.

Now, my friends, how beautifully, how aptly are not these words of St. Chrysostom in harmony with the Protestant mystery of mere bread and wine!

Why do I read the Greek? In order that you may pay greater attention to the English when you hear it.

But to cling to these said fathers, who are ever clinging to the Bible, let us take into our hands St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who in his Catechetical Instructions, delivered in the year of our Lord 351, says:—"As the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity, were mere bread and wine; but when the invocation has taken place, the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine becomes the blood of Christ."

Again: "As the Eucharistic bread after the invocation is no longer bread, but the body of Christ."

Again: "Let not your attention, therefore, be fixed upon them as being mere bread and wine, inasmuch as they are the body and the blood of Christ, according to the showing of the Lord himself. And, although your senses may suggest to you the contrary, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by the taste, but be by faith fully convinced that you have, beyond all doubt, been deemed worthy of the body and the blood of Christ."

Again: "This doctrine of the blessed Paul is of itself sufficient fully to confirm our faith concerning the Divine mysteries, of which having been made worthy, ye have, as it were, become identified and incorporated with the body and the blood of Christ. It is St. Paul himself who says, 'That our Lord

Jesus Christ, the very night in which he was betrayed, having taken bread, and having given thanks, broke and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, for this is my body; and having taken the chalice, and having given thanks, he said, Take, drink, for this is my blood.' (1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25.) Now, since he himself hath so manifestly declared and spoken concerning this bread, This is my body, who after that shall have the daring to entertain a doubt of it? And, since he himself confirms it, and says, This is my blood, who shall at any time presume to doubt, saying, This is not his blood?"—*St. Cyr. of Jerus. Catech. Myst.* 4, vol. i. p. 319.

Again, let us listen to St. Cyril of Alexandria, who flourished in the year of our Lord 412, a little before (if five centuries in the arithmetic of my learned friend be worth counting) the age of the said-to-be *Transubstantiation-inventor*, Paschasius Radbert. The words of the venerable father in question are—"Let these verbose and most absurd of men tell us with whose body the nurselings of the Church are fed, or from what springs her children are refreshed: for if the body of God is delivered, this God is the true God—Christ the Lord, not a mere man, nor an angel, as these men assert, nor a mere minister, nor one of the unbodied spirits; and if it be the blood of God, the cup of God, this God is not merely God, one of the adorable Trinity, the Son of God, *but the Word of God made man. But if the body of Christ be our food, and the blood of Christ be our drink, and this Christ be, as they insist, mere man, how is the body of life promised to those who approach to this sacred table? And how, again, shall this body take up its dwelling here, and in many places, and not be diminished?*

A mere body cannot by any means be the salient spring of life to those who receive it. Wherefore, let us receive the *body of life itself*—that life which for us has dwelt in our body; and *let us drink his sacred blood* for the propitiation of our sins, and the participation of that immortality which is in him, believing that he himself is at the same time the Priest and the Victim, he that offers, and he that is offered.” —*St. Cyr. Alex. Edit. Aubert. Lutet.* 1638, tom. v. pars 2, p. 377.

Wonder not, then, my Protestant friends, that this same doctrine was implanted in this island when the first missionaries from Rome arrived amongst us! Wonder not that the venerable Bede, our first ecclesiastical historian, when describing the nature of this sacrament, proves himself to be a Catholic, not a Protestant. “There is the form of bread,” says he, “but after consecration it is the body of Christ.”

Again: “*Oblato pane et vino, id est corpore et sanguine Christi:*” “Bread and wine being offered, that is, the body and the blood of Christ.” *Bede, Edit. Colon. Agripp.* 1688, t. v. lib. 8, p. 139.

Such was the language, my friends, of the venerable Bede, before the birth of the famous *Protestant-raised* magician Paschasius Radbert, and before the birth of the all-illuminating Reformation. But, exclaims, or at least will exclaim, my reverend antagonist, all the force of such overpowering testimony in favour of the Catholic, is totally annihilated by one single text of St. Paul, namely, “Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.”

Wonderful discovery! wonderfully sagacious deduction from this text of St. Paul, made by the improved readers of the Bible at the first dawn of the Reformation in

this island! But oh! shame upon my learned friend, to practise such an imposition upon you, as to attempt to confirm so modern an idea, by referring to the Greek pages of Theophylactus. Why, my friends, no later than this morning I visited the British Museum, in order to inspect the writings of that identical father, and I find that he has not the slightest notion of any such Protestant deduction from the text alluded to. On the contrary, that he conceives the meaning of St. Paul, throughout the whole chapter, most visibly to be, to direct the attention of the Jews from the sacrifices of the law, to the grand complotory sacrifice of the cross, without the least reference to any other Christian doctrine. Is it not, then, let me ask, a most extraordinary thing, that this should sound in your ears as a very powerful argument? and is it not also somewhat singular, that this said text, thus interpreted, never entered into the heads of Christians of former ages, as doing away with the Sacrifice of the Mass, which has uninterruptedly been celebrated in every part of the universe, in so many different languages and nations down to the present day? But what means it, after all? What is its pungency? “Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.” Now, I contend that the whole verse shows, that the reasoning of the apostle is confined to the old law, in which the victims for the sacrifice were always slaughtered; and almost all things in the *old law* “were purged with blood.” Secondly, suppose, for the sake of argument—for I have no objection, argumentatively, to concede a little to my friend—suppose, for the sake of argument, I say, that the declaration of the inspired writer applies to the new law. Let us suppose it

for a moment—why, I cannot see, even upon that supposition, that it militates anything against the Catholic doctrine, correctly and accurately stated; for we maintain that a full remission for sins has been made; we admit that full remission is only obtained for us by the shedding of the blood of Christ on the cross, *ONCE for all*. [A voice, “Put that down,” we presume as a hint to Mr. Cumming.]

Mr. FRENCH (sarcastically). Yes, put that down; but recollect to put *this* down with it—that is, Protestants profess that, by the power of faith in the efficacy of the one bloody offering, is presented an expiation for the sins of man to his offended God, whothereupon bestows upon him the contrition required for his offences, accepts his repentance, and applies the blood of Christ actually to wash away his sins. So we hold (*here is my argument*), that by the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, the infinite merits of the bloody sacrifice of the cross are offered anew to the Almighty [a murmur]—I say, *are offered to the Almighty*, who is moved thereby to bestow on the sinner grace, and a hearty sorrow for his trespasses, and to cleanse him in the blood of the Lamb, shed on Mount Calvary, for the redemption of a sinful world. Thus we hold, too, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins;” had Christ not shed his blood, there had been no remission. But mark, my friends, we do not allow it in the extent to which my learned friend wishes to carry it; we do not allow that the verse had any reference prospectively. It was all *retrospective*; the whole drift and scope of the chapter was of a retrospective nature, as to the contrast or comparison of the sacrifices. Besides, will my learned friend tell me that

Christ, before he shed his blood, his precious, his adorable blood, before he actually shed it, I say, that he could *not* have forgiven sins? will he tell me that he did not forgive any? Will my Bible-reading friend seriously maintain, that when Christ said to the man that “*was taken with the palsy*,” “*Man, thy sins are forgiven thee*,” (St. Luke, v. 20,) that there was *then* any actual shedding of our blessed Redeemer’s blood? Away, then, my Protestant friends, with this carnal interpretation of the text in question. Believe me, it was first made, not by any of the ancient fathers of the Church, who were ever *comparing*, in the language of St. Paul, “*spiritual things with spiritual*,” 1 Cor. ii. 13, but by men of real carnality, both in living and in reasoning; proud scorers of all ancient wisdom, and adorers of their own inventions.

One object of that letter of St. Paul to the Hebrews, on which Protestants so vainly rest their hope of stultifying the grand prophecy of Malachi—indeed the sole object of that letter was to reprobate the erroneous notion, that they, the Jews, were still to keep up their bloody sacrifices for sins. It is not necessary, he tells them, that Christ “should be often offered.” No part, therefore, of the reasoning of this epistle of St. Paul, I contend, bears against the Sacrifice of the Mass, “which is not bloody, nor requires that Christ should suffer any more.” *θυσιαὶ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀναίμακτοι*: “*Pure and unbloody sacrifices*,” says St. Cyril, teaching our Catholic Catechism, in the year 351; and as I tell you, over and over again, I would rather consult primitive antiquity on the meaning of the phrase, than I would my respected friend, however ingenious and talented he may be, “*in his speech and in his preaching, with the*

enticing words of man's wisdom."—1 Cor. ii. 4.

"An unbloody sacrifice, a victim of propitiation—*του ιλασμου*"—says that glorious Catholic catechizer, in the year 351.

And so it is in the Catholic Catechism at the present day, the whole world over, a *propitiatory sacrifice*. Yes, my Protestant friends, this resounds in all our catechetical instructions! But a new modern light has sprung up into existence that finds in this chapter something subversive of the great sacrifice of ages foretold by the prophet Malachi. Our belief, however, is, I contend, strictly analogous to the doctrine which is laid down in Scripture, and which constitutes the foundation of all our hopes and of every good and perfect thing—namely, the one great bloody sacrifice on the cross. "It is appointed," says the apostle, "unto men *once* to die;" so was Christ "*once* offered," according to all prophecy, to effect satisfaction for sins, which was made, once for all, by Christ upon the cross.

Its application was left to man's co-operating with Divine grace—the application of the bloody sacrifice on the cross was left to man's co-operating with Divine grace; and how can he co-operate with Divine grace more effectually than by adhering, in the most determined and unceasing manner, to the great unbloody sacrifice which has come down to us in an uninterrupted train of tradition from the apostles even to the present day? "If," says St. Cyprian (and mark the era, my friends, when he said it, namely, the year of our Lord 248), "if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the High-priest of his Father, and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of

him, then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the Church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father, doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which is commanded be not faithfully kept up."—*St. Cyp. Epist. ad Cecilium*, p. 109, Edit. Bened. Paris, 1726.

It is, then, by that great sacrifice, the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, that we apply to us the *fruits* of the bloody sacrifice on the cross; by the use of such means as Christ has appointed—faith, prayer, &c. I say, we apply it by co-operations with Divine grace. In the first place, co-operation by such means as Christ has appointed—such as faith—for without faith no man can be pleasing to Christ, although Christ did die on the cross. But there must be baptism also, prayer, &c.; although I am aware that in Calvin's doctrine faith alone will suffice, without even baptism, much less prayer. Calvin says, that "if a man have once grace, he never can lose it;" and though he may commit murder on murder, yet that the sweet creature has grace still unburied, still unextinguished in his bosom. [Murmurs of disapprobation in different parts of the room]. That is the real doctrine of Predestinarianism. "It may be smothered," says he (those are his own words)—"it may seem *extinguished*, still it is *there*—the man *cannot be lost*." Nay, more, he goes on further—and a dreadful, shuddering doctrine it is:—"If a man has once faith, all his *posterity* are to be saved," whether they be monsters of pollution, or not!! I say (to revert again), applying the bloody sacrifice of the cross by these means which Christ has appointed, viz. faith, prayer, baptism, and especially the solemn commemora-

tion of the sacrifice on the cross, made in the Sacrifice of the Mass on our Catholic altars.

My learned friend's argument against the Mass is, that all *with one oblation was consummate*, and that *Christ was offered once for all*. True, I answer, it cannot be denied; but that text is not to exclude that which Scripture delivers also in other places. "A clean oblation," says the inspired prophet, Malachi, "*was to be offered to God in all places*." Now that text cannot be understood of the sacrifice on the cross; that was not offered in all places, but on one only cross; much less can it be understood of the prayers or works of the ungodly race of men that arose at the Reformation, trampling upon the cross of Christ, and all the sacred emblems of our religion. No, my friends, the bloody sacrifice was offered only once; the unbloody is from age to age repeated. The one did consummate all by way of redemption, the other was instituted for application.

We have, therefore, an altar where they who are out of our Church have no power to eat, where they have no power to serve, whereon is offered to the eternal Father the same victim, his well-beloved Son, truly, really, and substantially present, according to the confession of accumulated ages—a confession never called in question till the sixteenth century. Nay, Melancthon himself says, speaking of Gregory the Great, who sent Augustin to christianize this island, "This Gregory did allow, by public authority, the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, not only for the living, but also for the dead."—*Melancthon lib. 4. Chro. in Hen. 4.*

But mark, gentlemen, though a holy victim on our altars, Christ is not there after a corporeal manner,

in the gross sense of that word, but in a spiritual and celestialized manner. "Not in a sensible, but mysterious manner," as St. Epiphanius, one of the fathers of the Church, eloquently and beautifully expresses it—"He, who in the same body, magnificently uplifted into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, unencumbered by any corporeal clogs, though not divested of the body which he raised in its spiritualized glory."

Thus, and *thus* only, my friends, can be reconciled the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, so clearly, so solemnly predicted by the prophet Malachi:—"For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering."—Mal. i. 10, 11.

That "*pure oblation*" is most demonstrably the Sacrifice of the Mass. It has been offered up in every age, as I have proved to you from historical documents, which my learned friend has not attempted to contradict or controvert. And how does he endeavour to question or overthrow them? Why, solely by giving us his arbitrary translation of St. Paul's epistles, and then by exclaiming in a dogmatical and authoritative manner, "There's the Christian doctrine." If he were the Pope of Rome, he could not speak in a more imperious and authoritative manner [laughter]—"there's the Christian doctrine." But now, gentlemen (as I am reminded that I have only two minutes more, I shall speak as rapidly as I can). If I might be permitted to make a request of my learned antagonist, who knows so well what passed in all antiquity, I would entreat him, however painful to his feelings the performance

of such a task may be, to devote some part of this argument to-day to a confutation of the authenticity of those liturgies which I have urged upon him. Let him throw overboard, to use his own reiterated expression, in a clever, plausible manner, all those immovable liturgies—let him totally annihilate, by some solid argument, the glorious testimony of the fathers of the Church, in every age, speaking the Catholic doctrine, the glorious tradition of ages, the harmonizing consent of all the nations of the earth—let him do this, I say, in a most unhesitating and overwhelming manner, and, my fellow-Catholics, the victory is his, the laurel is all his own. Again, again, and again, I cry out, however grating it may be to his delicate ears, give me a satisfactory answer to this question—How it is that the Eutychians and Nestorians, who still flourish innumerable in the East, and who separated from us fourteen hundred years ago—how it is that they combined with Catholics, after having renounced the Pope, to introduce into the world the Sacrifice of the Mass?

This is the grand question: how can it be resolved? This, I say, is the grand puzzler, the torturing perplexer for the clear head of my very ingenious and talented opponent. Such an answer, on his part, will be infinitely preferable to any arbitrary interpretation he may think proper to give to some hard text in St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, knowing, as my learned friend most unquestionably does, that, even after his illuminating them, a man may still *wrest them to his own damnation*. But, as I said before, I again repeat, I perfectly acquiesce with regard to that hard epistle in the sentiment of Theophylactus, σκοπος τῆ ἀποστολῆς δεῖξαι τὸ διαφορὸν

τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς καινῆς. That is, "*The drift of the apostle is to point out the difference between the Old and the New Testament.*" And now, to answer one more observation of the reverend gentleman, before I sit down. The fathers, says he, notwithstanding all the proud vaunting of Mr. French, are not unanimous upon any one point. They are, I reply, most unanimous on articles of faith; any other species of unanimity is not to be expected. In the interpretation of allegorical allusions and figurative expressions, I grant, one father may see one meaning and another another; but in dogmas of religion, I defy my learned antagonist to show the least discrepancy between them. But not to enter into too wide a field at the present moment, I shall content myself with observing, that if there be any one point on which the fathers of the Church seem to have gloried in exhausting all the powers of the Greek and Roman languages, in order to prove their perfect unanimity and concurrence of belief, it is the dogma of Transubstantiation; yes, where the fathers are most concurrent (unhappily for my learned friend, as I have proved to you), most indissolubly concurrent, is on the body and blood of our Saviour on the altar in the Sacrifice of the Mass. Nor, among these, is Theophylactus, to whom my learned friend has referred me, the least express. "What, then, do not we also offer up unbloody victims? Yes, most certainly we do."—*Theophyl. Venet.* 1854, tom. ii. p. 719.

[Here the learned gentleman's hour terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—You have heard so much, my Christian hearers, of the liturgies of ancient times, and so little of the Epistles and Gospels

of still more ancient times, that I feel it incumbent upon me, in deference to the reiterated demands of my learned friend, to show you what is the precise weight attached, by distinguished men in his own Church, to these liturgies, which he has attributed to apostolic, and almost to inspired ages. He has traced them by a very ingenious, but to my mind a very specious logic, to the days of the Apostles and Evangelists, and has asked, with a triumph which he anticipates rather than reaps—is not this a decisive proof that the Mass was sung and said in the days of the apostles, and, *à fortiori*, countenanced and taught by them?

I now hold in my hand the Ecclesiastical History of Dupin, whose authority, correctness, and weight, no Roman Catholic disputant will very readily disclaim or deny. This history is translated from the French of Dupin, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris. I shall read *his* remarks on the ancient liturgies (mind you, not *my* remarks, not a *Protestant's* remarks, but a Roman Catholic historian's remarks)—these I quote, not only for the sake of Dupin's testimony, but also for the sake of his irresistible disproofs of the genuineness and authenticity of these liturgies, which any one may enter into, and which are decisive whoever adduces them. "The liturgy, or Greek and Latin Mass, attributed to St. Peter, cannot be St. Peter's, for the following reasons:—" [you shall hear these reasons]—"since mention is made therein of St. Sixtus, Cornelius, and St. Cyprian. The Virgin Mary is called the Mother of God, a term that was not generally in use until after the condemnation of the Nestorian heresy. The canon of the Latin Mass, which is reputed by St. Gregory to have

been composed by a scholastic—that is to say, a learned man of the fifth century, is entirely inserted therein; moreover, it contains divers litanies, taken from the Sacramentarium of St. Gregory, and the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom (who of course did not live in the days of St. Peter). There are also prayers for the patriarch, a term altogether unknown before the end of the fourth century. It is evidently a document of the fifth, not the first century. In short, if St. Peter had been the author of this liturgy, it would have been used by the Church of Rome; neither would it have lain hid during so many centuries. These reasons made the learned *Cardinal Bona* say, that this liturgy was forged, and, in all probability, compiled by a Greek priest, Latinized because it is collected partly from the Greek liturgy and partly from the Latin, and the name of St. Peter was affixed to it either that it might attain authority," &c.

Irresistible facts and great names in the Roman Church thus disprove the pretensions of these liturgies to apostolic origin. If these liturgies were written in the first century, the writers must have been gifted with something of the foresight of my Highland countrymen, who see things prospectively centuries before they occur, and record them, it may be, four hundred years before they have been heard of. [Laughter]. In short, that St. Peter is not the author of the liturgy that bears his name, a cardinal of the Church of Rome fully admits. Dupin also, an historian of the Church of Rome, mark you, assigns it to the fourth century. My learned friend says it belongs to apostolical days. Now, if such doctors differ in the bosom of unity, whom are we to believe? The learned gentleman says he would prefer the learned doctors of ancient

times to me and other upstarts of the nineteenth century. Allow me the liberty to do so also. I give them the preference too.

MR. FRENCH.—Let me see the proof.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I shall read again:—"These *reasons made* the learned CARDINAL BONA" (mind you! not a layman—higher than a priest, higher than an archbishop—even a cardinal!) "say that this liturgy was *forged*."—Dupin, chap. i. p. 8. They are dishonest forgeries, and yet they are the almost only proofs of the Mass.

"The Mass of the Ethiopian, that bears the name of St. Matthew," says Dupin, "is evidently forged." p. 8.

"We ought to give the same judgment of the liturgy of St. Mark," adds Dupin, in the same place. "There are in it several prayers for the king, and even for St. Mark himself."

"Which circumstances," adds this Roman Catholic historian, "are apparent demonstrations of its novelty." Observe, this Roman Catholic historian says it bears such evident traces of its novelty, as no man with his five senses can dispute. Now, we will take the next liturgy on my opponent's list of "glorious liturgies," the Liturgy of St. James, and see how his own Church treats them. I am not on my authority treating them with this *hauteur*, mind you: it is the learned of his own Church that treat them so. "There remains only the liturgy attributed to St. James, which divers learned men" (my antagonist in the number) "have taken much pains to vindicate, but" (most melancholy!) "to no purpose; for although it is more ancient than those we have already examined, yet we ought not to say that St. James was the author thereof, or

that it was composed in his time." To the *disproofs* of Dupin, as distinct from his *authority*, I direct your attention:—

"I. The Virgin Mary is called, in this liturgy, the Mother of God, and the Son and the Holy Ghost are said to be consubstantial with the Father, terms altogether unknown in St. James's time. But supposing that they were not unknown in his time, is it credible that this authority should not be alleged in the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Constantinople?

"II. We find there the *Trisagion* and the *Doxology*—that is to say, the *Sanctus* and *Gloria Patri*, which were not generally recited in the Church until the fifth century.

"III. There are collects for those shut up in monasteries. Can any man say there were monasteries in the times of James?" (Observe, this is a Roman Catholic who asks the question!)

"IV. There is mention made of confessors, a term that was not inserted in the Divine offices till a long time after James, according to the confession of Bellarmine" (another cardinal and doctor of the church of Rome, you observe!).

"V. In this liturgy there is mention made of churches, incense, altars. Can it be imagined that these things were used in St. James's time?

"VI. We find many citations from the Epistles of St. Paul, the greater part of which were written after St. James's death." (Therefore, my opponent must have recourse to the old expedient, a miracle, viz. that St. James rose again, and appeared upon the earth, to help out Mr. French's defence of the Mass; and then we shall have a phenomenon parallel with the "immortal" dogma of Transubstantiation.) "Neither ought we to object, with

the cardinals Bona and Bellarmine, that these things were afterwards inserted; because it is not probable they should be added in so many places; besides, the connexion and ceremonies of the whole liturgy do not agree with the time of the apostle."—*Dupin*, Art. 1, pp. 8 and 9.

Now, where, my friends, is the *apostolicity* of these much-boasted liturgies? I have advanced no assertions of my own. I have gone to a cardinal, and he says they are some *three* centuries after the days of the apostles, and I have gone to Bellarmine, and he acquiesces in a similar sentiment; but I go to *Mr. French*, and he says, that these cardinals, these learned and distinguished advocates of the Church of Rome, the subtlest and the ablest that ever upheld the system, he says they both speak what is untrue. Then I do not desire him to take the *ipse dixit* of these learned and distinguished doctors, and thereby preserve unity, but to *weigh patiently and honestly the arguments which they give*, and he will come to the conclusion which I have come to, and which I am sure nine-tenths of this audience have come to, viz. that they *do not* belong to apostolical times.

In the outset of my learned antagonist's remarks, he said that I had attributed some concession to him which he really and honestly did not make. Now I shall not dispute about the concession; it was a paltry statement about some historical data, and I believe, last evening, I said I would give it up if he did not say so; if he did not make the concession, I offered to give up the advantage it presented, for I know there is such a substratum of solid, scriptural, and insuperable fact beneath my positions, that I can afford to be generous with the adversary with whom I

have to contend. I solemnly declare that, as far as I am conscious, I have not imputed to the Church of Rome, or to her defender, my learned friend, one sentiment which she does not profess, or which is not to be found in her authentic documents. I see on the walls of this school-room, "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord," and, having the fear of God within my heart, I feel the full force of that sentiment, and can call him to witness that I have not intentionally—and I hope my friend believes me, that I am speaking in the sincerity of my heart, when I say, that I have not intentionally misrepresented, misapplied, or misdescribed any one tenet of his Church, or any one principle of his faith. My friend, at the outset of his remarks, complained bitterly, that at the close of my statement, last night, some individuals thought proper to make certain slight emotions of acquiescence with their hands and feet. You are aware, my hearers, that this is expressly contrary to the rules under which this assembly was convened, and I deeply deprecate and deplore it; and had I only possessed the magnetizing power of some of the worthy doctors of the age in which we live, I would have mesmerized every hand and every foot, and have effectually repressed every symptom of approbation, or of the contrary. [Laughter.] But not being gifted with this magic, this mesmeretic power, I was utterly unable to do so; and I can only say to those Roman Catholics and Protestants who exercised their hands and their feet on that occasion, that, in deference to my learned friend, they will do so no more.

The next accusation brought against me is, that I used wanton and uncalled-for language in reference to dogmas which my learned

antagonist believes to be most sacred. I am not aware that I used one single epithet which was not either to be drawn from the premises I have laid down, when arguing against it, or found in the canons, or in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, when defining and determining the meaning of that dogma. And I can as deliberately and solemnly announce, that my heart's desire and prayer to God is, not that I may be the conqueror, but that he and I may be saved; and I do put the question to you, and to every one in this vast assemblage, with an energy and an emphasis which I trust will not be easily forgotten—*Am I your enemy because I tell you the truth?* [pointedly to Mr. French.] If *your* system will not stand the pure and unsullied blaze of light which the oracles of truth supply, then you have to blame your *popes* and your *bishops* who concocted it, not the humble advocate of the Bible who brings its truths experimentally to bear upon it.

My learned antagonist remonstrated very much with me for saying that Cain was the first Mass-priest. Now, while I deprecate everything like personal reflection in the course of this controversy—and I am sure the peaceable and orderly conduct which have hitherto prevailed will show that there has been very little of personal reflection on either side—you will recollect that my learned antagonist set me the example of this apparent deviation. Before I spoke about fathers and grandfathers, he told us first that Luther was the father of our Church; then anon, that Calvin seemed to have the honour of being our father—all of which nice controversy is a matter of genealogy and descent, which I am not anxious to ascertain. Then he made a con-

cession, which I hope he will not again dispute [to Mr. French], viz. that the Jews, who disbelieved our Lord in the sixth of John, were our fathers. In his generosity he brought our lineage to apostolic ages, and said the Jews, who disbelieved Christianity, were our first Protestant fathers. Now I guided the excavations of my friend a little further up the path of time, and showed, by a parallel, which I shall now briefly recapitulate, that Cain was the first Mass-priest; for the distinction which I reminded you of between the sacrifices of Cain and of Abel was, that one was bloody and the other not so. My antagonist admits that the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice—that is, that there is no shedding of blood in it; he admits also, that the sacrifice of Cain was an unbloody sacrifice—that is, that there was no shedding of blood in it. All I said and contended for was, that in this distinction consists the efficacy or inefficacy, as well as peculiarity, of the sacrifice. My antagonist contends for a sacrifice in which there is no shedding of blood; and therefore I said, that by Cain's offering is the Mass typified in the annals of inspiration, and in the book of Genesis, wherein it is recorded that Cain offered of the fruits and flowers of the earth an unbloody sacrifice to God. And the different accompaniments of the two offerings were probably these: When Cain, it may be supposed, brought his sacrifice to God, he said, probably, "O Lord, these flowers and these fruits I consecrate to thee, the beautiful though frail productions of the earth, pencilled by thy fingers, and tinted by thy handiwork; they have received their beauty from thy smiles, their fragrance from thy breath, their being from thy mighty power; I consecrate them unto thee, and offer

them as the just and dutiful symbols of my recognition of thee, my God, as *my creating, sustaining, and providing God.*" But Abel, when he presented his, felt that an unbloody sacrifice would not take away sins—just what I wish my Roman Catholic friends to feel. He brought an innocent lamb to the altar, and he poured out its *blood*, and his confession was:—"O God, thou art not only my Creator and Sustainer, and Preserver, but I have sinned against thee, my Father and my God; and I shed this blood in token that mine deserves to be shed, and as a type or foreshadow of that most precious blood through which alone there is forgiveness, and in which when washed, I shall be 'white as the driven snow,' 'without spot or blemish, or wrinkle, or any such thing.'" I say, these may be supposed to have been the addresses of the former, the fratricide, and of the latter, the martyr; and as the martyr's sacrifice was bloody, it cannot be the type of the Mass; but as the murderer's was unbloody, the offering justly typifies the Mass, and the offerer the Mass-priest.

My opponent next referred me to the life of some saints for evidence. I have not time to follow out the life of St. Francis, or any other of that kin; but when I come to the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, I shall give you a few extracts from his life, which will tell more than I am able to give of his character and principles. The next point my antagonist took up in his speech was some remarks I seem to have made about the meretricious splendours of the rites of the church of Rome. I admit their gorgeousness. I am not aware that I said these ceremonies were unscriptural—I do not know that they are so. I can only say they look to me very *suspicious*. that is all. One

of our own poets has beautifully said—

"Do we paint the rose, or add fresh perfume to the violet?"

If Religion be what she is declared in God's word to be—the most beautiful visitant that ever came from heaven to cheer our hearts with bright anticipations of a future, and without *her* all is darkness and despair in the homes of earth—if she be such a glorious and celestial visitant, then, indeed, must there be something in the native, unvarnished features of real religion, so bright and impressive, that ceremony sinks it, and all splendour deforms it. I maintain, however (as I shall afterwards prove to you), that the splendid ceremonies of the Church of Rome form rather the magnificent shroud in which she has entombed the whole body of the truth, rather than the ornament that forms the setting of that precious gem. I envy not your priests' tinsel, splendour, and their pompous ceremonies. They have compassed sea and land to give circumstance and pomp to their worship—they have hired the most celebrated *chefs d'œuvres* of painting and of music, from all quarters, and at any expense, to set off their forms; but what dying souls want is not *beauty*, but *bread*, by which they may be fed. What you and I need, is not ceremony which can dazzle the eye by unwonted splendour, but salvation that can bring the soul to our Father and our God! I naturally exclaim, as I gaze on the floating of your incense and the splendour of your rites, or listen to the peal of anthem and song, and note the whole display—Here, indeed, there is refreshment for every sense; but "*where have they laid my Lord?*" [Applause.]

The question that Mary asked at the sepulchre is the question which

every individual must ask whilst contemplating the Vatican's accumulated splendour—"Where, where have they laid my Lord?"

My opponent next introduced his former and hacknied statements about the fathers. I showed you, in my first speech, that the fathers were never deputed by the Church to make known its sentiments—my friend admitted the fathers not to be infallible. The fathers frequently contradict each other, and contradict each himself—a fact which invariably shows the necessity of appealing from fallibility to infallibility—"from Cæsar unto Christ"—from the words of man, "to the law and to the testimony." But I must throw out a sentiment that may appear somewhat peculiar on this subject, and it is, that what he is pleased to call the *fathers* were the mere *striplings*, or beardless boys of the Christian world. For, you observe, they had but the same Bible that we have; the same promises of aid that we have; the same sacred books that we have; and *we* have many advantages in addition—that is to say, we have the advantage of vast and varied biblical criticism, the discoveries of the age, the adjustment of erudite controversies, together with many other powerful auxiliaries, which must necessarily enable us to come to more competent conclusions on the meaning of Scripture. So that, really, I believe, the fathers of this contemned and despised nineteenth century are, perhaps, in a position more fitted for arriving at a consistent and correct interpretation of the word of God than the fathers of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and tenth centuries. As my learned friend has once referred me to Dr. Wiseman's lectures on his Church, I would refer him, by way of repayment, to a sermon

by Dr. Chalmers, on the respect due to antiquity, and also to the history of the Reformation, by a French divine, Merle D'Aubigné, in both of which he will find some very logical and useful lessons on ancient claims and characteristics.

The next point on which my friend has taunted me, according to his regular course, is my connexion with or descent from the learned Calvin. Now Calvin is not my infallible. He weighs not a feather with me; he is no guide or authority for me. If Calvin were to say anything unwarranted by God's word, I would treat Calvin as I treat Mr. French. Calvin is not my Pope. I am not in the least amenable to him. I am neither Calvinist nor Arminian—neither Jansenist, Jesuit, nor Papist. I must rebut this waste of words; and therefore I once for all disclaim Calvin as my dictator, guide, or oracle; whatever be the merits of Calvin—and they are unquestionably great, as my antagonist evinces by his hatred of him—he has no connexion with me, and I none with him. As to the high views which Calvin is asserted to have entertained—viz. that if a man had faith, all his children, all his posterity would be necessarily saved—I may add, *I defy Mr. French to produce any such sentiment* from the writings of Calvin, and that terminates the matter. I have read the works of Calvin, and I think him a most acute, learned, and Christian divine; but never read such abominable imputations: he has made mistakes in his writings, as well as the fathers, and especially the Pope, and therefore this bears out my advocacy of the more excellent way—to let Calvin alone, and have recourse to St. Paul, and see what *he* says on these momentous matters. My friend was candid enough to add, that if he were leaving the

Church of Rome, he would go to the Church of England instead of, and in preference to, the Church of Scotland. I am really delighted with the very hypothesis! [laughter] delighted with that monosyllable "if." It is a bright presentiment of good: he is coming so near to the certainty of his abandoning that corrupt and erroneous communion, that he hangs somewhat in suspense as to which branch of the Protestant Church he will join. I do from my heart congratulate you. I should be glad to hail you in our Scottish Church, but I am so pleased with the promise of a change, that I envy, but do not grudge the sister Church her learned and zealous accession. If he goes to the Church of England, he will have entered into a church characterized by able and devoted ministers, distinguished by a splendid literature, an apostolical liturgy, and a scriptural creed; by the noblest essentials of a true and Christian church of the Lord Jesus Christ. I therefore pray my friend to go to the Church of England, to cast the Canons of Trent into the Thames, and take the Thirty-nine Articles in their stead, and you will have made a happy exchange—and if the truths of that church reach your *heart* as well as your head—if the Spirit of God apply them to your conscience, as well as just reason commend them to your judgment—you will have made such a transition as will be productive of glory to God in the highest, and eternal salvation to your soul.

My antagonist again recurred to the phraseology and usages of the *soi-disant* ancient liturgies, for proofs of the existence of the Mass. For a reply to this part of his speech I refer to the extracts I gave from Dupin; secondly, to the extracts which I read to you at great length

from the apostle Paul, and lastly, to the narrative of a sabbath's solemnities, by Justyn Martyr, in the third century, in which that father furnishes a beautiful account of the worship of the early Christians, and in which there is not one word breathed or intimated about the Mass. I therefore insist, from these irrefragable premises, that the Mass is a dangerous deceit. I have gone to the Bible, and find no mention of it there. I have gone to Justyn, and he gives an account of the exercises of a Christian sabbath, which my friend tried to torture, with a Procrustes determination, into the shape of Transubstantiation and Adoration of the Host. I have gone to his last strongholds, the liturgies, and from the cardinals and historians of the Church of Rome, and from abundant evidence, proved them impudent forgeries. Driven out of all these, my opponent lugubriously complained that I had the last speech last night. Does my friend recollect that he had the two last speeches the two nights before? Time about is fair play. [Laughter.] If he for two nights had the last speech, I know he will be generous enough to give me the last speech for one night. At the first arrangement, my friend wanted *all* the last speeches (I hope I am not disclosing any private arrangements to Mr. French and Mr. Kendal, the Chairman,) but I remarked that such a request was quite an Irish kind of reciprocity—a reciprocity *all on one side*. [Laughter.] I suggested at last, that, if he had out of the five subjects, the last speeches of *three*, I should be satisfied with the last speech on two.

My antagonist referred next to the important use of the word *λειτουργία*. I find he has not understood my remarks on this word.

I have no objection to its being rendered *a sacrifice*. I do not object to call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice—the strength of my objection lies to the *defining* word, “a *propitiatory* sacrifice”—“there's the rub.” I wish you to keep in mind this distinctive epithet throughout. I call praise a sacrifice; I call prayer a sacrifice: I hold our bodies to be sacrifices. “I beseech you by the mercy of God that ye present your bodies living sacrifices.” But I object to call any of the rites or sacraments of the Gospel, as the Lord's Supper, “a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.” But my friend insists, notwithstanding my thorough confutation, that *λειτουργούντων* means, in the Acts of the Apostles, xiii. 2, celebrating Mass. Pray, sir, what was your Church about [turning to Mr. French] when she translated it “*minister*?” Your own Church, in your own version, prefers the translation “as they were *ministering* to the Lord,” and not sacrificing the body of the Son of God. My opponent says, *λειτουργέω* means *to offer propitiatory* sacrifice; his Church says, it means “to minister,” Now, which am I to believe? Mr. French or his Church?—*one* individual against a *whole* Church, the proud assumption of which is the high prerogative of inerrability and infallibility! His Church translates it, “minister,” Mr. French translates it, “sacrificing the Mass to the Lord.” How am I to reconcile the two? I really must say that I think the Church of Rome a more competent judge of the matter than her gifted son.

“Rulers are ministers to God,” (I quote from his own Bible, *λειτουργοὶ τῷ θεῷ*, the very same word. My friend insists that the word means “offering up the Mass

—offering up a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead,”) and, therefore, if so, in the prosecution of the principle he has laid down, he must hold that kings, magistrates, rulers, princes, angels, and pontiffs offer up the propitiatory sacrifice of the body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; or, in other words, “say Mass regularly.” I also showed you that this very word occurs in various portions of the New Testament, in any of which the meaning thrust upon it by my learned antagonist is totally insufferable and absurd. In Romans, xv. 27, the Douay or Roman Catholic Bible renders this very Greek word, “in carnal things to minister to them.” But, observe, if my learned opponent's new translation is to be preferred, the words should be, “in *carnal* things to offer up” a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. Reciprocity, therefore, enjoined by the apostle is, that if you partake of “spiritual things,” ye ought, by way of return, to say Mass as well as the Roman Catholic priests! Now, if my friend insists on the extravagant rendering of *λειτουργεῖν*, in consistency and on his own principle, he must, in the passages I have quoted, and to the full extent, apply the new version, and it will land him in practices so heterodox, that if he repent not, he will find by and by, that he will have placed himself under the *anathema* of the Council of Trent, and that absolution, with or without penance, may be a very questionable or a very difficult thing. [Laughter.] I referred you to another extract, viz. “angels are *ministering* spirits,” from the Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 14, as it is in the Douay Bible, “are they not all ministering spirits—οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα.” My

opponent insists that *λειτουργίᾳ* means, "to offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass." Of course he will explain the beauty of this rendering here. I insist on an explanation. If *λειτουργεῖν* means "to offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass," then of course it is a necessary *sequitur* that *angels* offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass. To the heirs of salvation, according to the interpretation of my friend, they offer up "a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and dead."

My learned antagonist next referred to St. Peter's words, "in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest as they do the other Scriptures to their own destruction."

The words *ἐν οἷς*, "in which," are of the neuter gender, in *which* there are "some things hard to be understood." He complains that I left out the word "unlearned;" I said, which "the unlearned wrest to their own destruction." But who are the unlearned? They are those who refuse to come to Him "who is meek and lowly," that they may learn of him. Now *these unlearned* "wrest them to their own destruction"—they are not in the habit of reading God's word, and are therefore unlearned. My friend knows whether he comes under that category or not. Observe, they "*wrest them*." I object to *wresting* Scripture as much as he does. I require every reader to apply himself with humility and prayer to the interpretation of that book which God has given to "be a light unto the feet and a lamp unto the path." The learned gentleman, soon after these irrelevant remarks, referred to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, on which he threw out many curious remarks, and once or twice I really did imagine that he was about to

give up the Mass from sheer shame in the presence of St. Paul. He said, if Christ's sacrifice was offered up "once for all" on the cross for the sins of all believers to the end of the world, that that was amply sufficient; but he added, in his own curious logic—It is wholly sufficient in *the sense* in which I used it. He next showed the modes of prayer and praise, and all those various means by which Romanists "*apply*" (mark that word!) the sacrifice of Christ." This was an evasion. Does my learned antagonist mean to try to escape with the old plea, that the Mass is the mere means of *applying* the sacrifice of Christ—the mere application of Christ's sacrifice, or the mere application of the fruits of Christ's sacrifice? The canons of the Council of Trent define exactly what it is; I shall read one of them, therefore, and shall see whether it be there *the application* of Christ's sacrifice, or, in very deed, *the sacrifice*. I read from the canons of the Council of Trent, chap. ii. sess. 22: "The holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is and becomes of itself truly propitiatory. The Lord, forsooth, being appeased by the offering of Christ, and granting grace and the gift of repentance, remits crimes and sins, even great ones.

Observe, through this Sacrifice of the Mass, "God remits crimes and sins, even *great* ones; for it is one and the same Host, the same person offering now by the ministry of the priests who then offered himself on the cross, only in a different manner of offering; and by this bloody sacrifice the fruits of that bloody one are abundantly received."

Canon iii. sess. 22: "If any one should say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross,

but not propitiatory, or that it only profits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions and other necessities, let him be accursed."

Whatever meaning my learned antagonist may in your hearing attach to the Sacrifice of the Mass, this meaning he *dare* not dispute. It is, his church says, a *propitiatory* sacrifice, by which sins and crimes, even great sins and great crimes, are forgiven, and by which the sins of the departed dead, who may not yet be purged from their sins, are also entirely and wholly forgiven. So that you are to remember that the Sacrifice of the Mass is not merely an *application* of the sacrifice of Christ—his own church denies that. Any demur on this point again brings him into collision with his church, and shows most plainly, as this discussion will further prove, that Roman Catholic ground is untenable; that he must retreat from the position which he occupied so triumphantly before we began. He admits in his statement, that Christ's sacrifice was a *bloody* sacrifice (in which blood is shed), and that the Mass is an *unbloody* sacrifice. Now this very distinction is, I have shown, a decisive ground for overthrowing the whole doctrine of the Mass. For observe, my irrefragable position, adduced on the last evening on which I addressed you, and to which a reply has not been attempted, was, that if the Sacrifice of the Mass is *not* accompanied with the shedding of blood—that is to say, is an *unbloody* sacrifice, then it cannot be a *propitiatory* sacrifice for the sins either of the living or of the dead; for the language of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews is express (ix. 22): "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and WITHOUT SHEDDING

OF BLOOD THERE IS NO REMISSION." Here is an absolute incontestable fact—"That without *shedding of blood there is no remission*." My learned antagonist will not surely plunge into that unbounded licence of "orientalism" which he condemns in everybody save in himself, and tell me that this is to be explained away by a figure, and that the language is not literal. He professes to adhere to the literal interpretation: he professes, at all hazards, to adhere to the *verbatim et literalim* statements furnished by the word of God. He must, therefore, listen once more to these words: "*Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins*." But there is *no blood-shedding* in the Mass; *ergo*, there is in the Mass NO REMISSION OF SINS. The Apostle declares, in the twenty-fifth verse of the same chapter: "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High-priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Now mark here! The apostle says that, "if Christ has been *often offered*, then must he have *often suffered*." If Christ is offered every day in the Mass, Christ must suffer bodily torment every day. It is not my interpretation. If speech is at all calculated to convey ordinary ideas, then the statement of the inspired writer is, "that there cannot be offering without its essential accompaniment in Christ's case of suffering." But my antagonist believes that when Christ's "body and blood, soul and divinity, *ossa et nervi*," are offered on the altars of the church of Rome, there is *no suffering*; he holds that Christ does *not suffer*. Mark that! If there is

no suffering on the altar, the apostle distinctly declares there is *no sacrifice*, no propitiatory offering. Propitiatory offering and suffering are utterly inseparable. Either the Mass is a cheat, or God's word deceives. Now these two simple facts I call on my friend to expound to me honestly and fairly, and to give me to-night an explanation of the harmony of the Mass with the Epistle to the Hebrews. He must be more than an Œdipus who is successful.

My learned antagonist, in the course of his speech, dissented from my assertions on the use and the application of the word *priest* in the New Testament. Now I call on my antagonist to prove, by reference to chapter and verse, that the Greek word *ἱερεύς*, which means "a sacrificing priest," is, in one solitary instance, applied distinctively to the ministers of Christ in any part of the *New Testament*. Now, mark my challenge. I call upon him to demonstrate satisfactorily to me and this assembly that the word *ἱερεύς*, which denotes "a sacrificing priest," is applied distinctively to the ministers of Christ in any portion of the New Testament: I know, my Roman Catholic friends, that your priests will dispute the dignity which I now claim for you on the authority of the word of God. You, my friends, according to St. Peter, are "priests unto God." You, according to St. Peter, are a "royal priesthood." If you be Christians, and have been washed in the Redeemer's blood, and justified by the Redeemer's righteousness, the apostle Peter, whom your church claims as the founder and head of her communion, says to all the believers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, "Ye are a chosen nation—ye are a royal priesthood." Now ask your priests—Will you allow that *WE* are

PRIESTS? If Peter be right, we are priests, and the word *ἱερεύς* is applied to *laymen*, to all *believers* in Christ, whereas it is not applied to ministers as such. Then the laity are necessarily priests, and, in this respect, are equal to the clergy, being Christian priests in the noblest sense of the word. The apostle also tells us that the laity, as priests, have sacrifices which they are to offer. He says, Rom. xii. 1, "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that ye present your *bodies* living sacrifices to God, which is your reasonable service." He declares that ye are not only priests, but tells you that you have offerings to present, viz. your bodies "living sacrifices unto God, which is your reasonable service." And again, Heb. xiii. 15, he says, "By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually." Now you observe, then, if there be no priest in the whole of the New Testament Scriptures, save those who are the children of God and spiritual priests, to offer up *spiritual* sacrifices acceptable through Christ—if my opponent can furnish not one solitary instance of sacrificing priests distinctively to make propitiation, then there can be no propitiatory sacrifice in the Christian economy. *No priest, no propitiation*; and, therefore, the Sacrifice of the Mass is *vox et præterea nihil*. There is but one sacrifice once for all on the cross, and one Eternal Priest, who was dead and is alive for evermore.

My antagonist admits, in the next place, that there is *full* remission of sins from the bloody sacrifice on the cross. He asserted in his speech this evening, that full remission of sins is obtained through the bloody sacrifice of Christ Jesus "once for all," *ἐφάπαξ*. He admitted this, you observe—"full remission." Well, if I have got *all*

my sins forgiven, what else do I want? If I have *full* remission in Christ, why seek more than "full" in the Mass? What can be the use of anything possessed over or beyond it? Cardinal Bellarmine admits that the bloody sacrifice of Christ on the cross was INFINITE, and that the Mass is FINITE. Now if Mr. French admits what the illustrious Bellarmine asserts, then observe, what is the inevitable consequence? The Mass is a work of supererogation—an attempt, a miserable attempt, to enlarge the INFINITE by the FINITE. Would it add to the boundless and inexhaustible ocean to drop a tear into the midst of its mighty and tumultuous waters? Would it deepen the hoarse murmur of the hurricane, or add to the rush of the wild tornado that sweeps irresistibly past, if you were to sigh or breathe in the midst of it? Would the dim, the feeble radiance of a taper, held up in the blaze of mid-day, increase those full and vivid splendours which flood creation when the sun has reached its zenith? Will ten thousand times ten thousand Masses—or, in other words, ten thousand times ten thousand FINITES, add one particle to that sacrifice which both parties hold to be INFINITE, or in all respects incapable of addition? [Strong sensation.] I ask, solemnly, my learned friend, If Christ's sacrifice is infinite, and if we have FULL FORGIVENESS through Christ's *bloody* sacrifice—PERFECT FORGIVENESS—if Christ's *bloody* sacrifice is infinite—I ask, what is the use of *four hundred millions of Masses*! at the lowest calculation, offered up during the last *forty years*, if Christ, by "ONE sacrifice," "ONCE FOR ALL," has given FULL remission of sins to all who faithfully receive him? Is it not monstrous madness in the priests—monstrous cruelty to the souls of the people—monstrous

absurdity in the judgment of men, for the Church of Rome to pretend to offer up his "body and blood, soul and divinity," *four hundred millions* of times during the last forty years? My dear Roman Catholic friends, I beseech you, by the worth of your souls, to look thoroughly at this. Do not let the Church of Rome dazzle your senses and lay a padlock on your judgments; but judge ye what I say. I speak to reasonable and reflecting men; and if my words will not stand the test and the scrutiny of mature reflection and Scripture analysis, cast them from you.

To show how the Roman Church trifles with what she believes to be the body and blood of the Lord of Glory, I will state a fact.

The Rev. Mr. Stoney lately had a discussion with a priest of the name of Hughes. Mr. Stoney stated in his presence that Masses were usually sold for *two shillings and sixpence*. [Sensation.] Mr. Hughes interrupted him, and said, "*he got a pound for one Mass!*" [Renewed sensation, and cries of "Order!"] Oh, strange and extraordinary theology, that leads a priest to pretend to offer up "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God!" for *half-a-crown*, according to Mr. Stoney, or, according to the priest, *twenty shillings!!* Mr. Hughes, in that discussion, exclaimed, that they were *not sold*: he admitted that money was received by the priests, and that Masses were said for the donor, but that they were *not sold*. He cherished some scholastic distinction about the word *sell*. He admitted that Masses were said for the donor, and that *money* was paid for saying them. It happens, also, that the *number* of Masses is in the direct *ratio* of the number of *half-crowns* that are paid! Mr. Stoney went on to observe that he knew the fact of a person, named

Bolger, bequeathing to the Rev. J. Roach, P.P., 600*l.* in cash, his plate, jewellery, books, horses, and jaunting-car, for Masses for his soul. The sum total might be 700*l.* Calculating the Masses at the usual price, we must infer, that by the hands of Priest Roach the body of Christ was to be offered up *five thousand six hundred* times for the deliverance of Mr. Bolger's soul alone!! Oh! if his ear were within reach of my accents, I would tell him of the glorious tidings which Mr. French has admitted this night, and Cardinal Bellarmine has recorded before him, that in Christ's bloody sacrifice alone is *full and glorious* remission for *all* sin; that in his *bloody* sacrifice there is everlasting forgiveness of *all* sin, and—"WITHOUT MONEY AND WITHOUT PRICE!" [Strong sensation.]

My learned opponent quoted much from St. Cyril, and applauded the principles of that father. Now, I have only to state, for my opponent's comfort, that Dupin quotes from Cyril these words:—"Not bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ *which these represent*," and adds, "One that believes with the Church of Rome cannot say the bread and wine *represent*." Dupin says his faith was suspected, and St. Jerome observes that he often changed his faith and communion too. One father, you observe, says this of another! So much for the "*unanimous*" consent of the fathers.

The next statement of my learned antagonist was, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was to be confined exclusively (I am giving his words) to the Jews, *not* to the Gentiles, and that it refers to those sacrifices only which were offered up by the Jews, and not to that propitiatory sacrifice offered up by the Church of Rome. If he keep to this principle, you will see where it will lead him.

If the Epistle to the Colossians was meant only for the Colossians, and the Epistle to the Thessalonians only for the Thessalonians, and the Epistle to the Ephesians only for the Ephesians, and for those only, we must give up possession of the Bible altogether, and believe those only to be truth which the oracles of Papal infallibility dole out. But to show you that the apostles did not mean the individuals only to whom these epistles were addressed, I shall quote the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 16:—"And when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the *Laodiceans*." Now, I say, when this Epistle to the Hebrews is read among Jews and PROTESTANTS, just cause it to be read in the Church of Rome also, and you will see what will be the consequences. Moreover, I maintain that great moral and spiritual truths delivered by the apostle are no less binding and true now than when first they were proclaimed. What was morally and spiritually true eighteen centuries ago, is morally and spiritually true now. There is no chronology in truth. If the apostle asserted it to be true eighteen centuries ago, that "without suffering there is no offering," it is equally true now. If the apostle asserted eighteen centuries ago that "many priests and many sacrifices can never take away sin," it remains just as true at the present moment that many Masses, many Roman Catholic priests, can never take away sin. And, therefore, instead of trying to do away with the applicability of this epistle to us, I would call on my learned antagonist to come and confront that epistle with the dogmas of the Mass, if he can muster hardihood to do so; and he will find that its proud pretensions, its ceremonials, and its

assumptions will vanish before the light of that holy epistle, "like the bats and the moles" before the piercing splendour of the sunrise. The other point which he repeated and reiterated this and last evening also was, if I could reply to the question when the Mass was introduced. This is an attempt to cover by chronology what is exploded by Scripture. You have all read the parable in the Gospel of St. Matthew, of the tares and the wheat. The husbandman found that some one whilst he slept had sown tares. Now suppose he came in to his wife and told her that the corn was blended with grown tares, though he in the first instance sowed wheat, and saw wheat springing up. His wife looks at the field, and says, "You are really mistaken, my dear; these tares, I assure you, were originally sown, and are part and parcel of the wheat. If you deny this, show me the hour when the tares were sown. If you cannot tell *when*, you have no right to presume that they are tares and not wheat." What, think you, would be his astonishment? He would say, "It is a matter of *fact* and not of *time*. I can show when there was *wheat* only: I now see tares in addition, and whatever be the time, 'an enemy hath done this.'" We say, during those dark and leaden ages, when man's intellectual and moral pulse stood still, when darkness covered the earth, and thick darkness the people — when successive generations slept and slumbered in apathy and ignorance, the Mass, and purgatory, and relic-worship, and the invocation of saints, and all the destructive tares of the Church of Rome, were largely and liberally sown by the great enemy of mankind, and these took root in the passions and shot up amid the corruptions of the human heart, like the plants

of the valley of Java, flourishing best in the murky eclipse of the moral luminaries of heaven, and beneath that pall of superstition which intercepted the light of God's sun, and plunged a whole race in spiritual and intellectual thralldom.

[The rev. gentleman's hour here terminated.]

MR. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen — The learned advocate of Protestant principles, has at length finished his usually erratic and unargumentative harangue, and intimated to you, that it is not fair on my part to express any kind of regret that he should have the benefit and advantage of the last word this evening. Now, I cannot refrain, in the very outset of my addressing you, to repeat, most deliberately, the expression of this my regret; that entering as I am upon the discussion of so vitally momentous a point of the holy religion which I profess, where I am acting on the defensive, and am dragged like a culprit to the bar of Protestant inquisition, I should not be entitled to the last speech. I declare that it is subversive of every principle of equity that I have not the last word. But so it is, gentlemen, *lex lata est*, the law is passed; my duty is to submit. Let my learned opponent, however, prove himself inclined to adopt an equitable mode of procedure this evening. Let him not in his concluding speech bring forward new arguments and advance new statements which I may be inclined to contradict and controvert, because he may give you that for proof which a breath of mine would overturn and extinguish in a moment. The learned gentleman, on the last evening of discussion, made one remark, which, in the hurry of looking over my notes, I had totally forgotten. He was

extremely facetious upon the point, and he told you a pretty story, which I have often heard, and which I will do him the credit to say must have appeared extremely original to a large part of his fond and gaping admirers. Such is the happiness of his gest and manner, when he either chooses to be original, or to act the original where he cannot but be conscious that he is a mere copyist. However, I must say, for I love plain dealing, it was remarkably stale to me; insomuch that I have heard it repeated over and over again. I shall, therefore, endeavour to repay it by something like originality; and though I shall repay it, my friends, in verse rather rough, colloquial, and unpolished, still I flatter myself it will sound a little more harmonious than his beloved bagpipe [laughter]; that very musical exhilarator of the gloomy mountains that adorn his native country. It is concerning "the face washed." I have heard this quoted by divines of the Church of England, and have heard roars of Protestant laughter produced by it, and I therefore thought I would one day, when I was in a poetical bagpipe mood, answer it; and when I do take the pen in hand, and feel something like the influence of a happy poetical vein upon me, I would have you to know, that although I may not be quite so successful as my reverend friend in his ever-dazzling *oriental* imagery, yet do I contrive, some way or other, to tell an agreeable story, a tale full of truth, and at the same time, to make those to whom I tell it laugh heartily.

The verses in question were written by me to a lady, in an epistle which I will read to you; and they were by way of answer to a Protestant bishop who had attempted to convert her to Protestantism, by

asserting, in the language of my reverend opponent, *that his church was the Catholic Church with its face washed.*

"*The Romish faith,*" observes the sapient bishop, "*differs from the English Protestant in the same manner as a face which has not been washed differs from one which has; inasmuch as the English have not absented themselves from the Church, but have only washed off the errors and corruptions of it, and worship God in the same manner as the primitive Christians did, after the death of their Saviour, when no such corruptions had gained ground.*"

Now, gentlemen, in answer to this right reverend anticipator of the sprightly, witty joke of my reverend antagonist, Mr. Cumming, I personify the Catholic Church, and make her answer *in propria persona*.

But first let me read the letter I sent to the lady, in order to counteract the machinations of that very logically seducing bishop.

"DEAR MADAM—I hasten to return an answer to the above lines, written, as you tell me, by a Protestant bishop, with the benevolent intention, no doubt, of affording matter of consideration to your reflecting mind. A reply, in return, on the part of that right reverend personage, would confer an indelible obligation on,

"Madam,

"Your humble Servant,

"DANIEL FRENCH."

Answer of the Catholic Church to the Bishop washing its face.

My face wants washing! what is it you mean?

If the true Church, could it become unclean?
If soil'd with error, Christ's own words must fail,

The gates of hell must against heav'n prevail.
Instead of rock, on which the Church should stand,

Its true foundation must be crumbling sand.
But no, 'tis stamp'd upon the sacred page,

Its columns mould not with corrupting age;
The Spirit that inspir'd its days of youth
Shall dwell within it, *teaching it all truth*
Till the world ends;—it ne'er shall know
decay,
While sects on sects shall rise and fade
away!!!

I, however, was not content with that, but another poetical visitation came upon me, and so I thought I would make the grave bishop look a little more un consequential, by striking out the following impromptu; the other being, as I imagined, too solemn for the occasion:—

Since washing first became a trade,
Each sect on earth in turn must fade;
No Church can stand th' eternal scour
Of sect on sect, endu'd with power,
To rub and rub and wash away,
To please the taste of modern day.
First, Church of England brought its wash;
The Unitarian calls it splash.
Last, Irving bawls, with sweeping brush,
No washing yet was worth a rush;
He scorns alike the gentle Fox
And foaming sanguinary Knox;
Declares their daub is all damnation,
His work alone is *inspiration*.
Quære, Bishop, who comes next,
To wash most like the sacred text?

[Laughter].

Such, my Protestant friends, was the manner in which I gave your learned bishop his *quietus*; and the same identical verses will, I flatter myself, serve the purpose of bringing down the pride also of my anti-episcopal and [applause and laughter] honourable opponent, who has been giving us *his* second-hand washing this night. [Laughter].

Now, gentlemen, I will give my learned friend the little *sugar-plum* I promised him. [Laughter, and cries of "Order!"]. The learned gentleman seemed desirous that I should pursue a certain course which he suggested; but as I do not like any dictation as to my mode of proceeding, I shall endeavour, as far as the time will permit, *seriatim* to pursue my own train of arguing, calmly, coolly, and deliberately, for in fast speaking I have no skill

whatever. But I beg leave to answer, first of all, to a mightily perplexing observation of my reverend opponent, as it appeared to him, made upon a text of St. Paul on the last evening. The learned gentleman translated it, "he has a priesthood unchangeable," as your Bible correctly translates it, and as mine translates it also, viz. "eternal, unchangeable." But, then, he gravely tells us that Theophylactus also translates the word *απαράβατον*, by "a priesthood that will admit of no succession," and therefore Mr. Cumming, the reverend argumentator, concludes we have no priesthood; that there is in the Christian dispensation no priest but Christ, and that it is all a vain and arrogant claim on the part of any church now extant to claim a priesthood or hierarchy. Nay, my reverend opponent was a little deficient in politeness on the occasion, pointing as he did with his finger to a Catholic priest who sat near me, and denying that he was in the least entitled to that sacred name. I can only say that I would not have thus acted towards his reverend coadjutor who sits near him [Rev. Mr. Parkinson], and who has acted in the most gentlemanly manner ever since I had the honour of seeing him in this room. However, to pass this by, I must inform my reverend opponent that I looked into the British Museum this morning, and I did find the passage alluded to was very accurately quoted by the reverend gentleman. But let my reverend friend observe, that Theophylactus translated the same word precisely in the same manner as the Catholic and Protestant translators of the Testament do, viz. *unchangeable priesthood*; but maintains that it means also, that which my learned friend contends for, namely, that it does not admit

of succession. Now, in annexing this meaning to the word at all, I will boldly say, that it appears to me, when I look at the derivation of the word, to be interpreting a little in the oriental style of my learned friend, though the father in question had no such meaning in view as that which my learned friend would fain deduce from it, namely, that when Christ died, all priesthood on earth should cease. No; such was very far from being that father's meaning, for he tells us he was himself a priest, as I shall soon prove to my learned friend to his utmost astonishment as well as consternation.

All that Theophylactus maintains is, that in his *quality* of priest he can have *no succession*; and therein we Catholics agree with him; the mighty priesthood of the great High-priest is exclusively claimed by Christ Jesus; but, notwithstanding this, ministers and priests he has under him of his own sacred ordination, according to this very Theophylactus, and according also to the Church of England itself, whose adversary my Calvinistic opponent does not *this day* profess himself, though he wounds it at every step he takes in a deadly matter.

Now then, mark, my friends, the passage I am about to lay before you from this father of the Church, to whom my ever-good-natured friend has kindly referred me, not meaning thereby, most assuredly, any harm to his own cause. Theophylactus, speaking of the dignity of the priesthood, of which he was one, being an archbishop also, thus writes:—See, moreover, the dignity of priests, how it is indeed divine! For although they should prove unworthy, how does this affect their office? They are the ministers of the gifts of God, and grace operates through their instrumentality,

in the same manner as Balaam spoke through the mouth of an ass. *Our unworthiness, therefore, hinders not the operation of grace; and as priests are thus made the vehicles of grace, τιμητεον αυτοις*, they are to be honoured.”—*Works of Theophylactus, Archbishop of Bulgaria*. Edit. Venice, 1754, tom. i. p. 765.

Now, then, mark, there is a passage in the Bible, as you well know, “Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven;” and it is, amongst other causes, upon this delegated power of absolving from sins, that Theophylactus, in the passage I have just cited to you, founds the honour to be given to the priesthood. But it is not on that alone that he founds it, nor does that passage contain the sole ingredient of the little sugar-plum I promised to my reverend opponent. Listen, my friends, to the following equally sweet, and to me equally palatable extract from the works of the same father:—“But when he says *This is my body*, he shows that the bread which is consecrated on the altar is the body itself of the Lord, and not a responding figure. For he does not say this is a figure, but this is my body; it being transmuted, as it is, by an ineffable operation; although to us *it may seem bread*, in consideration of our weakness, and that we have an abhorrence to the eating of crude flesh, and chiefly that of man; for which reason it appears to us to be bread; but it is,” says the father, and mark the *unorientalizable* strength of the words, *σαρξ δε τω οντι εστι*: “*It is in very deed flesh.*”

So much, gentlemen, for my learned friend's argument on the priesthood. Let him now hoard up that in his theological treasury, as a caution to him in future, not to put the Catholic disputant in mind of Theophylactus. [Laughter.]

Now I will take up the word ἱερεὺς, which the learned gentleman clings to so fondly. It is not to be found in the New Testament, says he; it is, say I, and I thus prove it. St. John, in the Revelations, i. 6, thus writes:—καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ: “And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his father.”

Is not the word here for the priests thus constituted by Christ, ἱερεῖς? If so, what becomes of this his novel argument? Nay, Theophylactus tells us that, even though the priests of the New Testament should be bad instead of good, vicious instead of virtuous, that this does not diminish the efficacy of their power, as Balaam spoke through the mouth of an ass. (I hope this circumstance will not afford any ludicrous remarks for my learned friend, as it certainly would if the book were, in his estimation, apocryphal). In like manner, says he, the instrumentality of the priest, however unhallowed his life may be, is still the sacred vehicle of the gifts of God, his sacraments.

I know my learned friend is full of repentance already for having directed me to this book [Laughter.] I see he is in great agitation, and it is natural enough—he has thrown me into a tremor before now. [Laughter.]

The learned gentleman has called upon me to give a satisfactory explanation concerning the word λειτουργός, and I willingly resume the subject, because I flatter myself that there is no subject in the whole compass of theology in which I am not able to give you a satisfactory answer, provided I have time. I never denied that the word λειτουργός, was used in the New Testament, sometimes in a figurative

sense; and the learned gentleman will acknowledge that the word ἱερεῖω, which means literally “to sacrifice, to slaughter,” is likewise sometimes used in a figurative sense. This mode of arguing, therefore, proves nothing in his favour. But the objection that he makes, of its not being found in the pages of the New Testament, even if it were true (as it is not), but if it were true, it is but a negative one. Suffice it for me, therefore, that the word ἱερεὺς, “priest” is to be found in the New Testament, and, to my apprehension, most indisputably applied therein to the Catholic priesthood.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Not as applied to ministers.

MR. FRENCH.—Not as applied to ministers? I do not care what it is applied to in your interpretation. I am perfectly satisfied with the accuracy of my own, re-echoing, as it does, the interpretation of ages, and I will not be dictated to by you! You only give a plausible and didactic interpretation of your own, or of your master, Calvin; erecting yourself, as I told you before, into a kind of papal chair. [Laughter.]

[The learned gentleman uttered this with much emphasis and warmth of delivery, which, caused some little excitement. Order being restored, the learned gentleman proceeded.]

And now, my friends, when I consider the well-known and triumphant fact that the Greeks, now in existence, have received it so from father to son, that the word λειτουργία, or liturgy in their language, means mass—when I reflect that, although it is celebrated by them with different ceremonies to ours, yet that the substance is still the same—when I reflect that the Armenians, the Syrians, &c. concur, from age to age, with the Catholic nations of Europe,

in offering up this grand sacrifice, I see most clearly, without the intervening of one single cloud or mist, the ever-during accomplishment of the prediction of the prophet *Malachi*, and without the accomplishment of which the Bible must fall to the ground as *unveracious*, namely:—"For from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathens, saith the Lord of hosts."
—*Malachi* i. 11.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It is not *shall*; it is *is* in the Bible.

[The learned gentleman, we presume, did not hear this remark, as it remained unanswered.]

Mr. FRENCH.—I need scarcely add that I thank my rev. friend from the bottom of my heart, for having enumerated the millions and millions of times in which that splendid announcement of *Malachi* has been and daily is, since the time of the apostles, accomplished all over the world, by the celebration of masses by Catholic priests. Will the learned gentleman, with all his tropes and metaphors and figures, which he will pour forth this evening, in usual substitution for argument, contend that the prophet *Malachi* had nothing else in view by such prediction but mere praise and prayer to God? Should my reverend opponent attempt this, as he will have the advantage of the last word, I shall only say by way of anticipation, that it could not possibly allude to such a sacrifice, since prayers were offered up to the Lord God of heaven from the days when *Malachi* uttered that prophecy to his death, and to the coming of our Saviour. Was not prayer as available then as it is now? Would the prophecy

find its accomplishment in that? No, gentlemen, I cannot too frequently repeat the grand, irrefragable argument; it has been testified in all the records of antiquity, from the times of the apostles, that the Mass has been celebrated in all languages and in all nations; and we are continually witnessing the accomplishment of that glorious prophecy in the millions of holy Catholics that are now spread over the face of the earth. It has been handed down amongst them from sire to son; it has ever been the doctrine of *the stewards of the mysteries*. Yes, my friends, in our catechetical teaching, in our books of instruction, by a regular train of priests, regularly ordained and consecrated, from the times of the apostles, in one continued and unbroken stream, has that noble prophecy of the inspired *Malachi* been resounded as referring to *the Mass* and *the Mass* alone; depend upon it, my friends, the more deeply you examine the more will you be convinced that the institution of the Mass, as well as all our institutions, carry along with them the stamp of infallible origin and divine appointment, throughout the long lapse of multiplied and progressive ages. And shall I, let me ask you, knowing, as I do, all this, ever be induced, think ye, to relinquish the faith so firmly professed and adhered to by my ancestors, in order to take up the arbitrary explanations and inventions of my learned friend in the nineteenth century? No, no! it is impossible; with the grace of Almighty God I will live and die a firm believer in the Catholic religion, in which alone is to be found the most fervent and devoted adoration of the blessed Jesus! And what is more—as I am speaking in the presence of the One Living God, I would rather be condemned to

roam about the face of the earth, an outcast or an exile from all domestic comfort and repose, begging my bread from door to door, and seeing my family reduced to the condition of the defenceless and the fatherless, than abandon that sacred faith, that primitive religion, which has been transmitted to me in one undeviating course of glorious tradition from the earliest times—the days of the apostles!

I now come to answer the notes which I have successively taken down. My reverend friend holds up Dupin as oracular; he holds him up as an unexceptionable Catholic. If he will only turn to many of our biographical dictionaries, he will find that he is far from being an unexceptionable Catholic, and that he has been suspected often on many grounds. But, nevertheless, we do acknowledge that Dupin is a learned man. Well then, what says he? Why, according to my reverend opponent, he suspects one or two of these liturgies. Let him do so; I reply, his orthodoxy as a Catholic is itself suspected; and suspecting from such a quarter, let my learned friend remember, is not tantamount to invalidating. The immortal liturgies feel no concussion from the shaking of an arm like his. But still, to do the man justice, if we look at Dupin we shall find, that for the substance of these liturgies he is a determined stickler. And now to come to Cardinal Bona, that illustrious and distinguished cardinal, whom my learned friend calumniates and traduces; for it is, on the part of my reverend antagonist, a most unwarrantable piece of calumny, when he declares that Cardinal Bona raises his voice against these liturgies. I would have my learned antagonist to know that Cardinal Bona is one of their staunchest and most resolute supporters, defenders,

panegyrist, and admirers. Cardinal Bona has said, and it is what all Catholics admit, that these liturgies, in the four first ages, were repeated orally, as was the Apostles' Creed, and not committed to writing. But Cardinal Bona ever most strenuously maintains that the said liturgies, and most particularly that of St. James, in those parts especially which relate to consecration and to the unbloody victim, came from the lips of the apostles. It has been maintained by many writers, that the Apostles' Creed, which I say, viz.—“I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth,” &c. and which you all say, was never committed to writing until the fourth century, and similarly with regard to the liturgies of the Church; and the reason assigned for this is, that the Pagans might not get sight of them, and thus be enabled to blaspheme our holy religion in that infidel manner in which my ears have been condemned to hear my sacred tenets blasphemed, on this and on former occasions, by the tongue of my Calvinistic opponent. Some, on the other hand, have imagined that they were written at an earlier period; but what all learned Protestants—all of them,—all without exception—really learned Protestants, and all learned Catholics maintain is, that those specific parts which I read to you the last evening, and which must have struck you with surprise, came from apostolic lips, as their fountain head. But what, after all, is the best attested authentication of these liturgies in question, that learning, human or divine, can furnish, in the estimation of my didactic friend? Why, really, if all the learned among Protestants and Catholics in the world were to substantiate the fact of their being genuine and authentic

monuments of antiquity, this disciple of Calvin, with whom I have the honour of arguing at the present moment, will not fail to exclaim, if I have the least penetration into his mode of thinking: "Well, it is not in the pages of the Bible, and so I do not care one straw for them!" That, indeed, my friends, will, if resorted to, be a most fulminating, grand argument to destroy the validity of the sacred monuments alluded to, namely, the liturgies.

One cause for which my learned friend suspects these liturgies—and a very ridiculous one it is—because mention, forsooth, is made in one of them, viz. of St. Mark, which liturgy is called his own. Why, of course, my friends, when St. Mark died, his name would be there, inscribed or added. And the same is applicable to St. Peter; and when we happen to find the name of such and such a saint in the Mass, we easily account for the name being there, because they successively died martyrs, and, of course, were successively added to it. We acknowledge that. But what has that to do with the question? We are now contending for the substance of these liturgies, where they mention "the unbloody victim," the victim of propitiation, *ἱλασμον*, which means "propitiation," and *θυσία ἀναιμακτος*, "the unbloody sacrifice." There they all agree, and all confound, most vociferously, my learned antagonist. Another reason, it seems, is, which sounded, it appears, like a blasphemy in the ears of my learned friend, but as perfect harmony and celestial music in mine, namely, that the Virgin Mary was therein called "the Mother of God!" Why, my Bible-reading friend says, he cannot find the "Mother of God" in the Bible! Will my reverend antagonist act the Unitarian to-night, in order

to carry out his argument? Why, when Elizabeth says, "Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord come to me?"—Does not Lord mean God? In the Unitarian's argument it does not consequently refer to God; but, surely, my reverend Calvinistic theologian will not thus quibble? When the Unitarian wishes to repel the force of these words, the *Mother of my Lord*, he says it is the Lord that is the man Jesus; but, surely, this is not the logic of my pious friend? Again, as the Unitarian ever recognises Christ as Lord, but not as God, when he meets, in the Acts of the Apostles, xx. 28, the following words—"The church of God which he hath purchased with his blood," what does the Unitarian do? He takes down one of the Greek MSS., and finds in it the "Church of the Lord, which he purchased with his blood." Thus it is that the Unitarian eludes the force of this tremendous text against him; but, let me ask, is this a weapon to be wielded in the field of controversy by my Trinitarian friend? Will he seriously maintain that when Elizabeth cries out, in St. Luke i. 43:—"And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me," means barely the mother of the man Jesus, and not the mother of Jesus true God?

But the late Dr. Burton, one of the most learned men of the University of Oxford, who wrote, some years ago, an elaborate and invincible book against the Unitarians, quoting the fathers of the Church, when he disputes with the Unitarians, deems it not incongruous with his plan of proving the divinity of Christ, to place in the frontispiece of his work this admirable extract from St. Athanasius:—*ταῦτα δε ἀπεδεχομεθα ἐκ πατέρων καὶ πατέρων, εἰς ἡμᾶς*: "These things we

have received from father to father, down to us."

Here it is very fair, in Protestant conception, to bring the fathers into play, because the Unitarian says, Prove me the godhead of our Saviour from the Bible; and the doctor seems to stand in need of some other subsidiary proof; but when we Catholics, who are persuaded that the flesh and blood of our blessed Saviour in the sacrament of the Eucharist are at least as provable from the pages of the New Testament as is his divinity, bring in the testimony of tradition from the fathers to the self-same point, my ingenious opponent (to use his favourite, I will not say, vulgarism, but polite nautical expression) throws all the fathers overboard *en masse*. Away with the fathers, he cries out; give me Paul:—as if, forsooth, I had not proved unanswerably, that as to "*the discerning of the Lord's body*" in the sacrament of the Eucharist, there is the most remarkable harmony between Paul and every one father of the Church that ever took pen in hand, with expressive force, to record his sentiments on the subject.

My friend will show, I apprehend, some respect to the fathers who presided at the Nicene Council in 325. Well, then, let him turn over the volume that hands down the proceedings of that council, and he will find, that when the divinity of Christ was to be decided, against the blaspheming Arian, the grand appeal made by the fathers who composed that council, in order to substantiate such divinity, was, not to the Bible, but to tradition; and to tradition also, with my opponent's good leave, we Catholics make appeal to substantiate the Sacrifice of the Mass. But mark, my friends, we do not therefore (for

I can easily anticipate that in my friend's logic I shall be said to have conceded that the Bible is against it) avert our eyes from the New Testament; on the contrary, we find the texts of the Gospel as clear and significant in our favour as the voice of tradition.

Again, as to the words "Mother of God," an expression which is not exactly to the taste of my pious friend, I would beg leave to remind him, that the fathers of the Council of Ephesus, where my friend tells us the words were first used, expressly declared that the word *θεοτοκος*, that is, *Mother of God*, had been used in apostolic days, and had transmissively come down to them. Now for the argument of my learned friend, as to the word "consubstantiation." Dr. Burton says it is a mistaken notion that the word "consubstantiation" was not used before the Council of Nice in 325, and he proves most clearly that it was used in the earliest apostolic days, and transmitted down to them. So much for these invincible arguments, attempting to overturn and undermine those nobly-towering monuments of antiquity that look down so proudly upon the arguments of Protestantism, the *Mass*-recording liturgies, from which I have proved, to my friend's inexpressible dissatisfaction, every point in discussion between us. Then, my friend proceeds to talk about the death of St. Paul and of St. James. I reply, that as to this we have no accurate historical *data* as to when St. Paul died, and when St. James died, and that is all I shall observe upon the subject. But my learned friend tells us he will say something more about the liturgies this evening. Now I reply, that it is extremely ungenerous and unfair. He has certainly a right to answer what I have advanced, but

to introduce any new matter, when he knows I am ending, is not at all the part of a fair and honourable disputant.

He then talks about our priesthood and Cain, and proves, to his own satisfaction, that Cain was the first Roman Catholic priest. Most extraordinary discovery! Worthy the elaborate investigation of a deep-searching theologian of the nineteenth century! But his tact is uniform; he is all along proving, that a stream, in proportion as it wanders from the fountain-head, becomes more and more clear and transparent—a thing in natural philosophy I never heard of before; but it appears to hold good in *moral* or religious philosophy! It appears to me that those who live near to the times of Christ and his apostles, ought to know more of pure, uncorrupt Christianity than we do, with all our criticisms, and laborious physical inventions. It appears to me that the blessed Ignatius, whom I quoted in the beginning of this discussion, and who said that certain heretics absented themselves from the sacrament of the blessed Eucharist, because they did not believe it to be the real flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and which flesh in his goodness the Father resuscitated, that he (Ignatius) certainly ought to know more of the doctrine of the apostles than my learned friend, who is just about to address you. The blessed Ignatius tells you this, and he moreover tells us that he had himself seen Christ Jesus. Now, when I read what that father says of the blessed Eucharist, I immediately recognise in him a priest of my Church; yes, just as clearly as when I look at the character of Cain, I see stamped upon his brow the same sacerdotal marks that fitted a Calvin and a

Knox for the dark ministry of the Calvinistic temple.

But really, gentlemen, though I must own I am not exempt from some degree of faultiness in noticing such puerile arguments of my learned friend, their virulence joined to their puerility reminds me forcibly of an Archdeacon Chapman, who, about fifty years ago, published a book something in the style of my learned friend, against our Catholic dogmas; and in which book he had the temerity to assert, that all the fathers of the Church were staunch sticklers for the Protestant definition of the Eucharist. The words of this *fac simile* in point of Christian softness of expression and character to my reverend opponent, namely, Archdeacon Chapman, are worth listening to; but the answer given to them by the Protestant Dr. Conyers Middleton, that splendid ornament of English literature, and author of the “Life of Cicero,” is still more memorable. I shall give you them both. The former will produce in the countenance of my reverend opponent an agreeable smile—the latter at least a dismal if not a gloomy frown.

The words of Archbishop Chapman, which will prove so exhilarating to my reverend friend, are—

“The ancient fathers of the Church, and especially the Clements, the Chrysostoms, the Jeromes, and the Augustines, are an armoury on the Protestant side, continually galling the Papists in some tender part, and exposing to every common eye the unscriptural and unprimitive crudities of the Romish principles and practices.”—*Arch. Chapman.*

Now the words of his fellow-Protestant, Dr. Conyers Middleton, which, if I mistake not, are about to prove an antidote to this cup of exhilaration for my learned friend, are the following:—

"The authority of those very fathers," he observes "as it is enforced by the archdeacon, would betray us into Popery; and in particular, that Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine, had severally taught and practised, and warmly recommended to the practice of all Christians, certain rites and doctrines which, from their example and authority, are practised at this day by the Romish Church, but rejected by all Protestant Churches as unscriptural, superstitious, and idolatrous.

"For example: this sacrament," the Eucharist, "was held to be a tremendous mystery, dreadful even to angels, and constantly styled the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and offered up as such, both for the dead and the living, over the tombs and ashes of departed saints and martyrs; which was either the same thing with what is now called the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, or at least a very near approach to it.

" . . . So that it was not possible," says the Doctor, "to take it any longer for mere bread, but something apparently divine and worthy of adoration, and transubstantiated consequently into the real body of Christ; for nothing else could naturally flow from those practices and principles of the fourth century."

"Here," says the same Dr. Middleton, in another place, "the superstitious practice of praying for the dead is acknowledged to have been used by the primitive Christians, as it certainly was from the earliest ages after the days of the apostles. The purpose of it, as declared by Tertullian and Origen, was to procure some relief and refreshment to departed souls in an intermediate state of expiatory pains.

"Again," says Dr. Middleton, "Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, was exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome. On which occasion it was his earnest prayer to God, that the beasts might devour his body so entirely, that no remains of it should be left to give his friends the trouble of gathering them. And he obtained his wish so far," (as the narrative informs us,) "that none but the greater and harder of his holy bones remained. Yet these were gathered up and carried to Antioch, and were wrapped up in lincn, as an inestimable treasure left to the Church by the grace which was in the martyr. See the relation of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, translated into English by the Protestant Archbishop Wake.

"Here then," continues the Doctor, "we see what was the practice of the primitive Church from the earliest ages."

The Doctor goes on:—"In the relation also of the martyrdom of Polycarp, who was burnt alive some years after at Smyrna, it is said that his friends gathered up his bones, more precious than the richest jewels, and tried above gold, and deposited them in a proper place, where they proposed to assemble themselves together, as oft as the Lord would give them an opportunity, to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom!"

Thus far the celebrated Dr. Conyers Middleton, a clergyman of the Church of England, in corroboration of a fact which cannot be denied—by the sons of learning, at least—namely, that the leading doctrines of the Church of Rome, which its enemies call *superstitious* and *idolatrous*, were the doctrines of the disciples of those very men who had been nurtured in the bosom of the true, the primitive Church, by the sacred apostles and the sacred evan-

gelists of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Yes, it is most evident and incontrovertible, that the primitive Christians revered the *relics* of saints and martyrs; believed in an intermediate state of punishment called *purgatory*; believed in the efficacy of prayer offered up by the living for the dead; and believed in *Transubstantiation*. Instead, therefore, of finding an *armoury* fit to be used against the Catholics in the pages of the fathers, they find in them, on the contrary, as may be seen by this ever-memorable concession of an adversary, a bulwark of strength, that gives a perpetual stability to their creed, and renders them eternally invincible in argument, whatever enemies may take the field against them. It is likewise equally evident, that so often as the Protestant condemns the worship of the Roman Catholic as being *superstitious* and *idolatrous*, he at the same time tacitly condemns all the fathers of the Church as being guilty of superstition and idolatry; indubitably certain as it is, and as I have proved it from their works, that they *adored the Eucharist, prayed for relief and refreshment to departed souls, considered the bones of martyrs more precious than the richest jewels, and tried above gold, and offered up the sacrifice on their tombs*—in one word, living and dying, practised all the rites, and acted up to the full spirit of that religion, which is professed by the Roman Catholic at the present day.

I predicted to you, my friends, and I think you have seen my prediction verified, that the quotation I have laid before you from the celebrated Protestant theologian, Dr. Conyers Middleton, would produce no very agreeable play of the muscles in the countenance of my reverend opponent. [Laughter].

Indeed, how can it be otherwise than the quintessence of gall to my honourable antagonist, being, as it unquestionably is, a confirmation of what I have been saying from the very beginning of this discussion, viz. that from the days of the apostles, the Sacrifice of the Mass has been offered up to the living God, according to that ever memorable and ever triumphant prophecy of the prophet Malachi, and which prophecy, little conscious of the sweet balm he was pouring into the soul of every Catholic present, by the procedure he adopted, my reverend opponent has most gloriously confirmed, counting and laying before you the fruit of his arithmetical labours, the actual number; in other words, the millions of masses that are being incessantly, day after day, offered up at Catholic altars, in various parts of the universe. Yes, my friends, I felt, whilst he was going through the minute detail, a joy that I never felt before, however frequent my triumphs, from the commencement of this disputation; and I am fully convinced that a similar joy pervaded the bosom of every Catholic present, whilst thus our glorious arithmetician was performing that elaborate task, and proving by all the laws of just science, the sum he had so accurately and sedulously calculated. And, my friends, let me tell you at the same time, that multitudes of those said masses, those grand, ever-during fulfillers of the prophet Malachi's prediction, are offered up by the holiest, the most pious, the most unpolluted of the human species. Yes, my friends, I have seen men at our holiest altars, and in our consecrated convents, from 90 to 100 years old, approaching, with their long flowing sacerdotal robes and venerable gray hairs, the altars of their God, there to

pour out the aspirations of their hearts, and employ their tongues in reiterating hallelujahs and hosannas, in tones of melting piety so celestially eloquent, that even my Calvinistic friend, had he been present, would have been reminded most forcibly of the prophet Malachi. You, my Protestant brethren, living in this contaminated city, and conversant only with clergymen of a terrestrial cast,

“ whose looks and thoughts
Are ever downward bent, admiring more
The riches of heav'n's pavement, trodden
gold,
Than aught divine or holy else enjoy'd
In vision beatific,”

can scarcely believe the purity that is cultivated by these ministers of God. Sometimes, I acknowledge, we have lamentable fallings off, because some there ever will be, so long as there is a priesthood upon the earth, forgetful of their sacred duty; but these degenerate, worldly-minded beings are, thank God, but few in number: and at the head of them all for unqualified apostasy, by merits “raised to that bad eminence,” stands the Priest Nolan, in whose conversion to Protestantism my learned friend now so exultingly glories. All I can say is, he was an impure, a baleful, and a loathsome serpent amongst us. I am glad, for one, that he has gone over to the Church of England, where he may possibly do some good, namely, by propagating against us those infamous, unfounded falsehoods which, when detected, as I myself have known them to be, by inquiring Protestants, are not unfrequently productive of conversions to our holy faith. But enough of this foul stain to our priesthood, this immaculate acquisition of Protestantism.

And now, gentlemen, before I conclude, I must not forget to reply to an observation of my reverend

opponent, on the extract he read to you from the Council of Trent. It is the passage in which the council speaks of full forgiveness of sins. Now, if the learned gentleman would but condescend to learn our articles of faith, he would find in those words of the council no cause for scandal. Every Catholic who reads that passage, knows full well that the Council of Trent has no power to forgive sins without repentance, and that no priest on earth can forgive sins without it. It supposes before, that you must pray most fervently and repent most sincerely, and be truly contrite [cries of “Order”], and that then pardon may be obtained by those who are thus sincerely penitent. That is our doctrine. [Increased interruption.]

[Mr. French desired the chairman to count the time that elapsed during the restoration of order, saying, “I cannot proceed with such interruptions.”]

My reverend friend, who will soon have to address you, will, of course, as usual, leaving to us an uncontested, unlitigated ground, *antiquity, the consent of nations, apostolical succession, lawful mission, communion with the chair of St. Peter, &c.*, direct your attention to the Bible, and, totally forgetful of all my reference to the Bible, will vociferate, as usual, that I dare not enter into that inward sanctuary. But, my friends, would to God, in referring to that sacred volume, which the Catholic Church has handed down to us, that he would make it speak its own meaning and not *his*; and that he would, moreover, bear steadfastly in mind, that the ancient Catholic Church, whether that was his or mine, ever insisted on her sole authority in finally determining controversies in religion, and that she never permitted sectarians to

appeal from her decision to the letter of Scripture unfolded according to their own *private interpretation*, to use St. Peter's phrase, but uniformly obliged them to stand to her judgment. In proof of this, my friends, we have but to carry our minds back to the case of the Arians, in the year 325, who no less pretended to plain Scripture, in disproof of the divinity of Christ, than my learned friend has this evening, in disproof of the Sacrifice of the Mass. So utterly did the primitive Church condemn that anti-Bible liberty of *private interpretation* of these mysterious pages, which is the *foundation and very essence* of Protestantism.

Indeed, my friends, if my reverend opponent would but reflect deeply, he would find that whilst he will not listen to Scripture, as interpreted by the Church of ages, or by the holy fathers, or any otherwise than as interpreted by his proud self, it is not the Scripture, but himself that he appeals to. I said, my friends, Scripture, as interpreted by the holy fathers, and I join, on one single point, with Calvin and with Beza, namely, in eulogizing St. Augustine above all the other witnesses of antiquity; St. Augustine, I say, who, in the words of Beza, was *omnium veterum theologorum tum Græcorum tum Latinorum princeps*: "Of all ancient divines, both Greek and Roman, the Coryphæus." Well, then, if Calvin and Beza speak truth (and my learned antagonist, at least, will not studiously attempt to convict them of falsehood) it becomes a point of vital importance to ascertain, whether, to use the figurative language of old Protestant Cartwright, by adopting the sentiments of St. Augustine, we *throw a smothering blanket over all Protestantism, or thereby open a window to bring in all Popery.*

Come we then, my friends, at once to the investigation. In the first place, St. Augustine is found teaching that we receive the true body of Christ, *not only spiritually, but in a visible sacrament, in veritate ipsa, in truth itself.* (St. Aug. xxvi. 27, in Johan.) In the forty-sixth number he is found teaching, *that the body of Christ is not only a figure, but also the verity; and that the same body which was born of the Virgin Mary is given to be eaten.* In the thirty-second number he is found teaching, *that Christ, according to the letter, was in different places at the same time.* In the thirty-eighth number he is found teaching, that Christ, in the sixth chapter of St. John, *amply treated of the blessed Sacrament.* In the fifty-fourth number he is found teaching, *that we eat our Lord, but in such manner that we harm him not by our eating, whilst, on the other hand, we fortify and benefit our souls by such divine participation.* In the sixty-third number we find him teaching, that to eat Christ and to preach him are widely different; whereas, my reverend opponent has strenuously contended that they are both one. In the sixty-fourth number he is found teaching, *that we should confess faithfully, that what before consecration was but bread and wine, after consecration is the flesh and blood of Christ.* In the seventieth number he is found teaching, *that it is the flesh and blood of Christ which are received under the form or likeness of bread and wine.* Lastly, as I quoted to you on the first day's disputation—*But no one eats that flesh without adoring it first—not only is it no sin to adore it, but we sin if we adore it not.*—St. Aug. Benedict. Ed. vol. iv. Pars. 11.

What more, let me ask, could be said, or what could be said more energetically antidotal to Protest-

antism by any Pope or Papist in the world?

And yet, if we listen to my reverend opponent, this is the father of the Church that is most emphatically hostile to Transubstantiation! According to him, and I allow the quotation to be accurate, *we should eat Christ with faithful heart and mouth*. Why, I ask no more than that it be granted by my opponent that not only by heart, but also by mouth, Christ may be eaten. My antagonist dwells most triumphantly, in his own estimation, upon the words of St. Augustine, "Why do you prepare your teeth and your stomach? Believe only, and you will have eaten," not reflecting, that if such words as these are to do away with the Catholic sacrament, they must do away likewise with the Protestant one of mere bread and wine; whereas all that St. Augustine meant to inculcate by them was, that our own best and grand preparation for the sacrament was firm belief as to its contents, and ardent desire to receive it; and then, whether you received it or received it not, owing to unforeseen accident or casualty, it was all one, and so say we Catholics at the present day. But the doctrine of my antagonist does away altogether with the Lord's Supper. With him it is all a mere farce. Such is "*the glorious gathering up of the inspiration of Protestantism, at least in its Calvinistic form.*"

The great St. Augustine, however, as you see, my friends, taught far otherwise. Indeed, what can be more clearly, more pregnant demonstrated than the Sacrifice of the Mass in the pages of St. Augustine:—

Listen, my Calvinistic friends, if any such be present.

"For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that

one teach you again what are the first principles of the oracles of God."

ST. AUGUSTINE, L. C.—"Then Abraham (Gen. xiv.) was blessed by Melchisedec, the priest of the most high God, of whom many and great things are said in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii.), which epistle most people ascribe to the apostle Paul, and some deny it. Then first appeared *that sacrifice which now is offered to God by Christians in all the earth*; and that is fulfilled which, long after the fact of Melchisedec, was said by the prophet of Christ: *Thou art a priest, according to the order of Melchisedec*. (Ps. cix.) Not according to the order of Aaron: for this order was to be annulled, when the things which those shadows prefigured should come to pass."—*De Civ. Dei*. L. xvi.

Mal. i. 11.—"And in every place incense shall be offered to God, and a clean offering."

Heb. xi. 38.—"Now the just shall live by faith; if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

Ibid. c. xxii. t. vii. p. 435.—"This eating and drinking, of which the wise man speaks (Eccles. iii.), relate to the participation of this table, which the Mediator of the new covenant, the priest according to the order of Melchisedec, offers of his body and blood. *This sacrifice has succeeded to all those of the ancient covenant, which were offered as the shadows of this that was to come.*"

Ibid. lib. xvii. c. xx. p. 434.—"The prophet Malachi, foretelling the Church, which we now behold propagated by Christ, in the person of God, thus manifestly speaks to the Jews: *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun to the going*

down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering. (Malach. i.) Since then we behold this sacrifice, in every place offered to God by the priesthood of Christ, [hoc sacrificium per sacerdotium Christi, cum in omni loco videamus offerri] according to the order of Melchisedec, and the Jews cannot deny that their sacrifices have ceased, why do they still look for another Christ?"—*Ibid.* lib. xviii. c. xxxv. p. 517.

Ibid. p. 666.—"The Hebrews, in the victims which they offered to God, in many and various ways, as became so great a subject, prefigured the future victim, which Christ has offered. Hence Christians, by the holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ, celebrate the remembrance of that sacrifice. But the Manicheans understand not what they should believe, or what observe, in this sacrifice of the Christians."—*Contra Faustum*, lib. xx. c. xviii. t. viii. p. 345.

Then, to the objection of his adversary, that the Catholics had substituted the martyrs in the place of the idols of the Gentiles, he replies: "The Christian people celebrate the memories of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, in order to excite themselves to an imitation of their constancy, to be united to their merits, and to be aided by their prayers: but to no martyr, to the God alone of martyrs, in memory of them, do we raise altars. For what prelate, assisting at the altar where the bodies of the martyrs lie, was ever heard to say: To thee Peter; to thee Paul; or to thee Cyprian, do we make this offering? To God alone, who crowned these martyrs, is sacrifice offered.—We frequently sacrifice to God in the churches of

the martyrs, by that rite, according to which, as the Scriptures of the New Testament declare, he commanded Sacrifice to be offered to him. This pertains to that worship which the Greeks call *Latria*, and which can be offered to God alone."—*Ibid.* c. xxi. pp. 347, 8.

"It cannot be doubted, that by the prayers of the holy Church, and by the salutary sacrifice, and by alms, which are given for the repose of their souls, the dead are helped; so that God may treat them more mercifully than their sins deserved. This the whole Church observes, which it received from the tradition of the fathers, to pray for those who died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when, in their turn, they are commemorated at the sacrifice, and it is then announced, that the sacrifice is offered for them."—*De verbis Apostoli*, Sermon. clxxii. t. v. p. 827.

But the fathers, my reverend antagonist insists most perseveringly, are not unanimous on any one fundamental point. Say you so, my learned friend? Then I challenge you to make good your words, by asking their opinions, one by one, on the *Sacrifice of the Mass*. St. Augustine has, in all conscience, spoken plainly enough, so as to need no more quotation. Let us begin with a father who was fellow-labourer with St. Paul, and whose name (if we may credit St. Paul) is in the book of life, St. Clement.—*St. Paul Philipp.* iv. 3.

ST. CLEMENT OF ROME, L. C.—"Whatever God has commanded to be done at stated times, that we must perform in regular order: thus must our offerings be made, and the liturgies (that is masses) performed; not inconsiderately, and without order, but, as it was ordained, at stated times and hours. They, therefore, who in this manner pre-

sent their offerings, are acceptable to the Lord, and blessed; for, following his commandments, they do not go astray.—*Ep. 1 ad Cor. n. 40, t. i. PP. Apost. p. 170.*

Now hear St. Irenæus, A.D. 177, and see if he breaks the unanimity I boast of.

ST. IRENÆUS, L.C.—“Giving advice to his disciples, to offer their first fruits to God, not as if he stood in need of them, but that they might not seem ungrateful, he took bread into his hands, and giving thanks, said: *This is my body.* Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, *which oblation the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers it to God over all the earth*—to him who grants us food—the first fruits of his gifts in the New Testament, of which the Prophet Malachias spoke: *I will not accept offerings from your hands. For, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a clean sacrifice.* Manifestly hereby signifying, that the first people (the Jews) will cease to offer to God; and that in every place a sacrifice, and that clean, will be offered to him, and that his name is glorified among the Gentiles.” [On this passage, the learned Protestant editor, Dr. Grabe, observes, “It is certain that Irenæus and all the fathers—either contemporary with the apostles, or their immediate successors, whose writings are still extant—considered the blessed Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law, and offered bread and wine on the altar, as sacred oblations to God the Father; and that this was not the private opinion of any particular church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the Universal Church, which she re-

ceived from the apostles, and they from Christ, is expressly shown in this place by Irenæus, and, before him, by Justin Martyr and Clement of Rome.”—*Nota in Irenæum, p. 323.*] *Adv. Hær. l. iv. c. xvii. p. 249.*—“Therefore the offering of the church, which the Lord directed to be made over all the world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God, and received by him.”

In the year, therefore, 177, Mass was said, as it was said in the day of St. Clement, which were the days of St. Paul.

Let us now descend to the year 248, and give ear to St. Cyprian, and listen whether or not he touches upon the same cord.

ST. CYPRIAN, L.C.—Writing to the clergy and people of a certain district in Africa, he laments that, contrary to an established rule, a brother clergyman had been appointed, by will, an executor or guardian, when it was the sole duty of the ministers of the Gospel “to attend to the altar and sacrifices, and to prayers and supplications.” Such likewise, he observes, was the view of the Almighty in the establishment by Moses of the Levitical order, and then adds: “The same disposition holds good now, that they who are promoted by clerical ordination be not called away from the service of God, nor perplexed by worldly business; but, receiving aliment from their brethren, they withdraw not from the altar and from sacrifices, day and night intent on heavenly things.”

He next remarks, that, in a case like this, it had been decreed, that for no brother, who by will had made such a disposition, “any offering should be made, or sacrifice celebrated for his repose; because he merits not to be named at the altar in the prayer of the priests,

whose wish it was to withdraw them from the altar." He, therefore, forbids prayers and oblations to be made for him.

Again: "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the High-priest of his Father; and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him; then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father, doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which was commanded be not faithfully complied with."—*Ibid.* p. 109.

Again: "To God and his Christ, whom I serve, and to whom, with a pure and undefiled countenance, in persecution and in peace, I unceasingly offer sacrifices."—*Ep.* lxi. p. 124.—"Whilst we were offering sacrifice, the girl was brought in by her mother."—*De Lapsis*, p. 189.

This unanimity, therefore, being unbroken by St. Cyprian, descend we now to the year of our Lord 313, and examine the writings of Eusebius of Cæsarea, anxiously inquiring whether they speak comfort to me or to my Calvinistic opponent, who so daringly and unblushingly asserts that the fathers are not unanimous on the Sacrifice of the Mass!

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA, G. C.—"And as he (speaking of Melchisedec) who was the priest of the Gentiles, seems never to have offered animal sacrifices, but wine alone and bread, while he blessed Abraham; so our Saviour and Lord first, and then the priests who are descended from him, performing, in all nations, according to ecclesiastical ordinances, the sacerdotal function, represent, in bread and wine, the mysteries of his body and salutary

blood, which mysteries Melchisedec had so long before, by the divine Spirit, foreknown, and used in figure. The Scripture of Moses says: *And Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God: and he blessed Abraham.*" (Gen. xiv.) *Demonst. Evang.* l. v. c. iii. p. 223. *Coloniæ.* 1688.—"Since then, as the New Testament," &c.

Now let us visit a father flourishing in the year of our Lord 351:—

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, G. C.—He mentions the various prayers and ceremonies which accompany our sacrifice of the altar, and adds: "When this spiritual sacrifice is ended, and this unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation, we supplicate God, for the common peace of the churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies, and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted, and, in a word, for all who want assistance. Again, when we offer this sacrifice, we commemorate those who have departed this world before us. We offer up that Christ who was sacrificed for our sins, propitiating him who is so merciful for them and for us."—He proceeds to the Lord's prayer, which is recited in the Mass, and dwells on its several clauses; and then prescribes the reverential manner in which the body and blood of Christ are to be taken.—*Catech. Mystag.* v. n. viii. ix. x. p. 327-8.

Oh glorious, unassailable unanimity! Descend we now a little lower, to A.D. 372; what says St. Gregory of Nazianzum?—

ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM, G. C.—"And where, and by whom, could God be worshipped in those mystic and elevating sacred rites, than which nothing among us is greater nor more excellent, *if there were no priesthood, nor sacrifice?*"

Knowing this, and knowing besides that no one was worthy of this great God, this *sacrifice and this priesthood*, who had not first offered himself a victim to the Lord, how should I dare to offer to him that *external sacrifice*, that antitype of great mysteries, or to take up the name and habit of a priest?"—*Orat. i. t. i. p. 3, 38.*—Again, "Julian, in impure and wicked blood, washes away his baptismal rite, opposing initiation to initiation—he defiles his hands, in order to purify them from that *unbloody sacrifice*, through which we communicate with Christ, with his divine nature, and his sufferings."—*Orat. iii. in Julian, t. i. p. 70.*

St. Gregory of Nazianzum, therefore, thus repelling the assertion of my learned friend *as to want of unanimity*, let us hear St. Ambrose speaking at the same period—sounds he harmony or discord?

ST. AMBROSE, L. C.—Commenting on the appearance of the angel to Zacharias (*Luke*), he says: "It were to be wished that, while we burn incense on our altars, and offer sacrifice, the angel would assist and become visible to us. That he does assist, cannot be doubted, while *Christ is there, while Christ is immolated;—for Christ, our pasch, is sacrificed.*" (1 Cor. v. 7.) L. i. in *Evang. Luc. c. i. t. i. p. 1275.*—"We have beheld the Prince of Priests coming to us; we have beheld and heard him offering his blood for us: we priests, then, follow him as we can, and *offer sacrifice* for the people, weak as we are in merit, but rendered honourable by this *sacrifice*: for although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet *is he offered on earth, when his body is the victim.*"

In a letter to his sister Marcelina, giving an account of some disturbances at Milan, when an attempt was made to seize the church, he relates: "The next day, which was

Sunday, after the reading and sermon, when I was explaining the creed, word was brought that officers were sent to seize the Portian church, and that part of the people were flocking thither. I continued to discharge my duty, and *began Mass*: but, as I *was offering*, I was informed that the people had laid hands on an Arian priest. This made me weep, and I prayed to God, in the midst of the offering, that no blood might be shed in this quarrel." *Ep. xiv. Classis i. t. 11. p. 853.*—Having heard from the Emperor Theodosius of the victory which he had gained over the tyrant Eugenius, Ambrose writes to him: "I took your letter with me to the church: I laid it on the altar, and, whilst I *offered sacrifice*, I held it in my hand, that by my voice you might speak, and your august letter perform with me the sacerdotal office."—*Ibid. p. 1021.*

St. John Chrysostom, who lived A.D. 397, has already, in a former discussion, been copiously cited on this subject, and has been proved to be philharmonic on the grand subject. One or two passages more, however, from that illustrious father are too remarkable to be left unquoted:—

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, G. C.—On the words of the prophet Malachi: "*And in every place incense shall be offered to God and a clean offering;*" he says, addressing the Jews: "When did this happen? When was incense thus offered? When this *clean sacrifice*? You can produce no other time than *the present*, the period since *the coming of Christ.*—And if of this time the prophet had not spoken; had he prophesied not of *our sacrifice*, but of that of the Jews, his prophecy would have been contrary to the law: for Moses forbids sacrifices to be offered in any other place than

that which God had chosen. To this he confines them. But Malachi declares, that, in *every place* incense shall be offered, and a clean sacrifice. In truth, however, there is no discordance between them. They speak of different sacrifices. In the first place, the prophet foretels that, not in one city, as among the Jews, but from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offerings shall be made. Then, by calling the *sacrifice clean*, he plainly denotes of what victim he spoke.

"Wherefore it is necessary that the priest be pure, as if, placed in heaven, he stood among the celestial spirits. For when you behold the Lord immolated, and the priest presiding over the sacrifice, and pouring out prayers, and then the surrounding multitude partaking of the sacred blood, can you, at that moment, fancy you are among mortals, and dwelling on the earth? Rather, are you not transported to the heavens?" — *De Sacerd.* l. iii. c. iv. t. l.

These sentiments he often repeats:—"He has ordained a sacred rite, changing the victim, and, in the place of animals, commanding himself to be immolated."

Hom. xxiv. in 1 *Cor.* t. x. p. 213.

"It was not in vain that the apostles ordained that, in the celebration of the tremendous mysteries, mention should be made of the dead. They knew that great advantage would thence be derived to them. For all the people being present, and raising their hands to heaven, and *the sacred victim lying there*, shall not God be rendered propitious to them?"

"*This sacrifice* is a copy of that; the *offering is the same*. Not one on one day, and on the next another; *but always the same*. Thus, then, the sacrifice is one. But are there many Christs, as the offering is

made in many places? By no means: it is the same Christ everywhere; here entire, and there entire; one body. As, then, though offered in many places, there is one body, and not many bodies; *so is there one sacrifice*. He is our High-priest, who offered the victim of our expiation: that same victim we now offer that was then offered; which cannot be consumed. This is done in remembrance of what was done. *Do this*, he said, *in remembrance of me.*"—*Hom.* xvii. in c. ix. *Ep. ad Hebr.* t. xii. p. 168.

But come—let us travel downwards to A.D. 412, and hear the Mass proclaimed from the lips of St. Cyril of Alexandria:—

ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, G. C. —"We offer in the church a holy, vivifying, and unbloody sacrifice; not believing it to be the common body and blood of man, but the real body and the real blood of the life-giving Word. For common flesh cannot give life, which our Saviour himself attested, saying: *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.*"—*John* vi. 64. *Declar. Anathem.* xi. t. vi. p. 166.

"God said plainly to the Jews, that they were not pleasing to him, or rather, that he would not accept their sacrifices in shadows and figures: but foretels, that his name shall be great among all nations, and that, in every place and nation, pure and *unbloody sacrifices shall be offered.*"

Say ye, my friends, does not all this constitute harmony?—Ay, it is super-harmonization.

But listen to one, in the year of our Lord 440—the great, the truly great and stupendously eloquent St. Leo.

ST. LEO.—He remarks, speaking of the passion of our Saviour, that "the variety of eternal sacrifices ceasing, the single *oblation of the*

body and blood takes place of all other victims." But this properly is referred to the bloody sacrifice on the cross.—*Serm. viii. de Pass. Dom.* p. 265. Afterwards he thus writes to Dioscorus, the same bishop of Alexandria whose reprehensible conduct we have just seen:—"That the discipline of our churches may in all things agree, this should be observed; that when a more solemn feast calls the people together, and more meet than the church can contain, the *offering of the sacrifice* be repeated, lest any be deprived of it; for religion and reason demand that *the sacrifice* should be as often offered as there are people to partake. Otherwise, if the custom of one Mass be followed, they who cannot find place must be deprived of *the sacrifice*."

Hear again, St. Eucherius, of the same period, A.D. 434:—

ST. EUCHERIUS, L. C.—"Let all unbelief be gone, since he, who is the witness of the truth, who is the author of the gift; for the visible priest does, by his word and secret power, *change the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood*, saying thus: *Take and eat, this is my body*, &c. And therefore, as, at the command of the Lord, the highest heavens, the deep waves, and the vast earth suddenly rose out of nothing; so, by the like power in the spiritual sacraments, the virtue of the word commands, and the effect obeys. *Let no one doubt that these creatures*, by the nod of his power, by the presence of his majesty, *pass into the substance of the Lord's body*. When the creatures to be blessed by the heavenly words are placed on the altar, before they are consecrated by the invocation of the name of the Most High, the substance of bread and wine is there; but, after the words of Christ, *it is the body and blood of Christ*."

And what wonder is it, that he who could create these things by his word *should change them when created*? Nay, it seems matter of less wonder, if that which is acknowledged to have been created of nothing *is now changed into better*. Search what is hard for him to do, to whom it was easy to raise things visible and invisible by the power of his will; to whom it was easy to clothe man made of the matter of clay, with the image of his own divinity," &c.—*Hom. v. de Pasch. sub nomine Eusebii Bibl. PP. t. vi.* pp. 363, 637.

And now, my friends, what says my learned opponent to this eye-dazzling *unanimity of the fathers on the Sacrifice of the Mass*? Will he attempt to overturn it by an appeal to the early councils? Let us take the grand Council of Nice, held in the year of our Lord 325.

COUNCIL OF NICE, G. C.—"The holy Synod has been informed, that, in some places and cities, the deacons present the Eucharist to the priests—a thing which no canon nor custom has taught—that they, who have themselves no power to offer, should present the body of Christ to those who possess that power."—*Can. xvii. Conc. Gen. t. ii. p. 38.*

Now to the Council of Laodicea, held A.D. 374.

COUNCIL OF LAODICEA, G. C.—Having established certain rules to be observed in the service of the Church, it adds: "And after the priests have given the kiss of peace to the bishop, the laity must do the same one to the other, and thus the holy offering be completed: but the ministers alone may approach the altar, and there communicate."—*Ibid. Can. xix. t. i. p. 1409.*

Now to the Second Council of Carthage, held A.D. 397.

SECOND COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE, L. C.—It enacts, that, "if any

priest, having been reprimanded by his bishop, withdraw from his communion, and offer sacrifice privately, erecting altar against altar, contrary to established discipline, he be deprived of his office.”—*Can. viii. t. ii. Ibid.* p. 1161.

Before I conclude, gentlemen, I must beg leave once more to call your attention to one passage of St. Augustine.

“Those sacrifices, therefore, signifying promises, were annulled. And what was given as compleatory of these promises? Why, *that body which ye know*, which all of you do not know” (meaning the Catechumens—that is, *persons not yet initiated*,) “and which it were to be wished that not any might know to their condemnation.”—*St. Aug. Edit. Bened. tom. iv. p. 334.*

Now, my friends, you cannot possibly be ignorant, with what carefulness and trembling caution the priests of the Church concealed the awful mysteries from the Pagans; a carefulness and caution which, in ancient books, goes under the name of *the discipline of the secret*, and to which St. Augustine here most incontestably alludes. Their chief object in doing this was, lest their ears should be continually grated, and in a manner defiled, as ours, my Catholic friends, have constantly been during the course of this discussion, by the blaspheming tongues of mocking and loud-laughing infidels. Hear, on this subject, the Rev. John Kirk, that learned investigator into primitive antiquity, whose name is so much the terror of my learned and bold antagonist.

“The *secrecy*, with which the early Christians celebrated the divine mysteries, is a most remarkable feature in the discipline of the primitive Church; and, in connexion with the *Liturgies* and the *Catecheses*, affords a general and irrefragable

proof of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. ‘It was customary,’ says Fleury, ‘to keep the sacraments concealed, not only from the unbelievers, but also from the Catechumens; and they not only did not celebrate them in their presence, but they dared not even to relate to them what passed in them, nor speak even of the nature of the sacrament. They wrote still less about them; and if in a public discourse, or in a writing which might fall into profane hands, they were obliged to speak of the Eucharist, or of some other mystery, they did it in obscure and enigmatical terms.’ *Manners of the Christians*, c. xv.—Abundant proofs of this discipline are found in the works of the holy fathers.” Of these I shall for the present select only one from St. Gaudentius of Brescia.

ST. GAUDENTIUS OF BRESCIA, L.C.—Speaking of the Paschal Lamb among the Jews, and the manner in which it was distributed, he says, “Of all the things pointed out in the book of Exodus, we shall at present treat of those only which *cannot be explained before the Catechumens*, which, nevertheless, it is necessary to discover and explain to the newly baptized. In the shadows and figures of the ancient pasch, not one lamb, but many were slain; for each house had its sacrifice, because one victim could not suffice for all the people; and also because the mystery was a mere figure, and not the reality of the passion of the Lord. For the figure of a thing is not the reality, but only the image and representation of the thing signified. But now, when the figure has ceased, the one that died for all, immolated in the mystery of bread and wine, gives life *through all the churches*, and being consecrated, sanctifies those that consecrate: *This is the flesh of the Lamb—this is his*

blood: for the Bread which came down from heaven said: *The bread, which I shall give you, is my flesh for the life of the world.* His blood is rightly expressed by the species of wine; because, when he says in the Gospel, *I am the true Vine*, he sufficiently declares all wine, which is offered in the figure of his passion, to be his blood. And he who is the Creator and Lord of all natures, who produces bread from the earth; *of the bread makes his own proper body*: (for he is able, and he promised to do it) and who of water made wine, and *of wine his blood.* *Oh the depth of the riches of the knowledge and wisdom of God!* (Romans xi. 33.) It is the pasch, he says, that is the passover of the Lord: think not that earthly which is made heavenly by him, who passes into it, *and has made it his body and blood.* Believe what is announced to thee; because what thou receivest *is* the body of that Celestial Bread and the blood of that Sacred Vine; for when he delivered consecrated bread and wine to his disciples, thus he said: *This is my body; this is my blood.* Let us believe him, whose faith we profess; for truth cannot lie. Let us not break this solid and firm bone: *This is my body; this is my blood.* Now, what remains in the sense of any one, which he does not conceive by this exposition, let it be consumed by the ardour of his faith.” —*Tract. 11. De Pasch. Bibl. PP.* t. v. pp. 946, 947. Edit. Lugduni, 1677.

After this most pregnant and illuminating extract from St. Gaudentius of Brescia, I think it totally unnecessary to say one single word more upon the subject; but I cannot refrain from adding to it what the learned Protestant Casaubon has said in reference to this primitive usage:—

“Is there any one,” says the Protestant Casaubon, “so much a stranger to the reading of the fathers, as to be ignorant of the usual form of expression which they adopt, when speaking of the sacraments—the initiated know what I mean? It occurs, at least, fifty times in the writings of Chrysostom alone, and as often in those of Augustine.”

You see, then, my Protestant friends, most clearly, in St. Gaudentius of Brescia, who flourished in the year of our Lord 405, what was the discipline of the secret; you see plainly, that the primitive Christians shuddered as much as we do, lest the ineffable, adorable mysteries of the Christian altar should become an object, as ours has been this evening, of derision and scorn to those who know not that *the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God.* (1 Cor. iii. 19). In other words of the same apostle, which I would address without acrimony to the discordant, eternally varying sects here present—“For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?” (1 Cor. iii. 3.)

But, my Catholic friends, what is our consolation for all the bitter revilings that have issued from the mouth of my learned antagonist against *the deep things of God*, (1 Cor. ii. 10.) the awful, tremendous mysteries of the Catholic altar? Reflect, my pious, my keenly, sensitively, deeply-wounded friends, *ye whose faith stands not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God*, (1 Cor. ii. 5)—reflect, I say, that Christ Jesus, when he was here a sojourner upon earth, was himself scourged at the pillar, and spit upon, and mocked, and despised, and had the head of the scorner shaken at him, and he answered not; and

ought not we, my fellow-labourers, and fellow-bearers of the cross of Jesus, that badge of glorious in fame, to endure with meekness of spirit all this blasphemy, in imitation of his divine example? ought we not to bear it just as the fathers at the Council of Nice felt themselves in duty bound to listen to all the unheard-of horrors of the blaspheming Arius? I say unto you, therefore, my Catholic fellow-sufferers, upon this sad occasion, *in patience possess ye your souls.* (Luke xxi. 19). It seems, indeed, and with real sympathy for his soul I say it (for it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God), an incurable propensity on the part of my learned antagonist, to disregard every thing that is true, hallowed, and venerable, and to deprecate *with the leaven of malice and wickedness* (1 Cor. v. 8.), every thing which we Catholics adore with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. Many Catholics who came into this room to witness this interesting dispute, hearing the improper language which my friend used, and which repeatedly fell from his lips, even at a time when he solemnly declared that the nearest object of his heart was the conversion of his poor benighted Catholic neighbours—hearing this, I say, they have left off attending; nay, I will go still further—a Protestant clergyman, who came the first evening, hearing the manner in which my friend spoke of the sacred body and blood of Christ, could not actually bear it, but went out of the room, declaring most distinctly and most audibly that he would never re-enter it during these discussions. And, therefore, I do most earnestly request of my reverend friend, that he will govern his tongue, and not lapse again into the same disorder, of which I have so repeatedly complained.

To take now a transient glance at my notes, my learned friend says, What authority have you for saying that Christ, in the sixth chapter of St. John, was preparing the minds of his disciples for the sacrament of the Eucharist? Why, I reply, had only one of the four Evangelists alluded to the sacrament, I might have been in doubt; but having the three others spoken to it, and St. John not having glanced at it elsewhere, I am positive. And, my friends, I read to you, in a slow and solemn manner, that divine and inexpressibly sweet refreshing chapter to the soul of a Catholic—I read it to you the other night, and I know it sank deeply into many breasts; and instead, my friends, of my being converted by the vain babbling of any modern sectarian, as my antagonist gravely affects to look for, I confidently trust, though these gray hairs are daily, nay, hourly, reminding me of the tomb, that I shall yet have, before I die, the consolation of seeing these my efforts to illustrate this said sixth chapter of St. John, prove the source of many a conversion even in the town of Hammersmith; ay, even among those who *may* not have had the opportunity of attending this discussion. It is at the great tribunal of public appeal that we are to appear; when men are in their sober kind of mind, not to be disturbed and elated by those ecstasies of rhetoric into which you are about to be thrown at the present moment, when not cool judgment and reason, but wild enthusiastic raving, are about to lord it in your minds, and to strip them of their reasoning faculties. Then I say, when this dispute shall be over, you will be enabled to look at the vast mass of evidence which I have laid before you, on the doctrines of pure, unadulterated antiquity, in contradis-

inction to the reiterated observations of my learned friend, that in proportion as the world advances, the deeper is the insight into the meaning of the apostles. I deny it strenuously! Common sense itself rises up against it—all the fathers rise up against it—all the learned doctors of the Church of England rise up against it, from Dr. Grabb, and Dr. Cave, even down to the Unitarian, Dr. Priestley himself, when he is arguing with the Trinitarians.

My friend has often accused me of wandering from the argument, and making a kind of irrelevant and straggling speech. I deny it! I have used sound argument from beginning to end—I may, now and then, have fallen into repetition; but even in this I have followed all those models who are held up as good and sound argumentators, from the time of Aristotle down to the present day; namely, that when you are solicitous to impress upon the minds of your audience any great argument, you must reiterate it over and over again. And I certainly should, by dint of incessant repetition, make the learned gentleman to go home this evening with that glorious prophecy of Malachi ringing in his ears, and engraven on the *fleshy tablet of his heart*, added to his own accurate statement of the many millions of masses that are daily offered up from east to west, in verification of its accomplishment. It was indeed unwittingly, blunderingly done, on the part of my learned antagonist, thus to serve so conspicuously that cause which, by such a calculation, no doubt he had it in his intention to disserve most materially; but, alas for my learned friend! *quod dixit, dixit—what he has said, he has said*; the accurate calculation cannot be recalled; the millions of

masses daily offered up at Catholic altars cry out with a loud voice, that the prophet Malachi did not pour forth from an uninspired mouth the following words—"For from the rising of the sun, even to the going down, great is my name among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrificing, and there is offered unto my name a clean oblation; because my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts."—Malachi i. 11. Yes, my friends, the Sacrifice of the Mass will for ever respond to those grand, predictive, and descriptive words: *So long as the sun and moon shall endure, throughout all generations!*—Ps. lxxii. 5. I can only say, as my excellent friend Mr. Kendal, our Catholic chairman, hast just reminded me of my expiring time, that, as no one argument adduced by my reverend antagonist has hitherto been of the least avail to him in disproving its divine institution, so I am persuaded that the declamatory trumpet which is about to begin its usual flourish, will be equally vain and nugatory with his past endeavours, in the estimation at least of the reflecting part of my audience.

[The learned gentleman's hour here terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—For the severe, and I do think, uncalled for, reprehension of my tongue, and of my statements, to which my learned antagonist has given utterance, I at once, for one and all, most fully and heartily forgive him; and, to show how lightly I regard them, I cast them all behind my back, and would not waste a moment in reply—a good cause needs not such weapons. It is my desire that all personality should cease, that all light and irreverent expressions should be withdrawn, for I do feel, Mr. Chairman,

that a subject of the most vital interest, and to one or other of eternal importance, is involved in this controversy. I see in this assembly, it may be, two hundred and fifty Roman Catholic auditors, and at least two hundred and fifty PROTESTANTS; and I must confess, that if the canons of the Council of Trent be right, if the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon the Mass be right, I cannot make my *charity* the grave of my *faithfulness*, by withholding the assertion that two hundred and fifty of one party stand before God and before me on the verge of death and misery everlasting. I believe that there is but one way through which the guilty can be saved; and if your Mass is that way, then there is nothing but "a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" for us Protestants. I will try, as exhorted by my opponent, to be as cool and as collected on this question as I can; I will try to give vent to no enthusiastic remarks, but directly, *seriatim*, and as closely as I can recollect, endeavour to reply to some objections which my learned antagonist has made in the course of the truly extraordinary address which he has just now delivered. First of all, he denies that the word ἀπαράβατον means "*intransmissible*," — "*not transmitted from one to another*." Now, he knows quite well, that if the expression ἀπαράβατον, applied to the priesthood of Christ by the apostle, means "this man hath an intransmissible priesthood, or an *incommunicable* priesthood," "because he continueth ever"—it is all over with the priesthood of the Roman Catholic church, as far as Scripture is concerned. He knows right well, that if Christ's priesthood, or power of offering up and applying propitiatory sacrifice (for I insist on that word "*propitiatory*" sacrifice)—is not transmissible from Christ—not

alienable from Christ—exclusively his—the priesthood of the Church of Rome have not one *iota* of authority to sacrifice upon their altars "the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God."

To show you my reasons for its meaning, as I have defined and declared it, I refer to *Stephanus*. He explains it—*Sacerdotium quod præterire non potest*; that is, "*a priesthood which cannot pass over or be transmitted*." Again, I take the *Lexicon Constantini*, and here I find—*Perpetuum Sacerdotium quod ad alium transire non potest*: "*A perpetual priesthood which cannot pass over to another*." I gave you the explanation of Parkhurst's before; I have now given you that of Stephanus's; and lastly that of Constantinus's; three of the chief lexicographers of the world, and they all distinctly and plainly declare that ἀπαράβατον means, "*a priesthood which is not transmissible, a priesthood inalienable and incommunicable*." And if this be the *fact* (mind you, it is not *my* assertion! it is the decisive and well-weighed assertion of these distinguished lexicographers) then the Church of Rome must declare that her priests have assumed functions which they have no lawful right to assume—that they have engaged in an office to which they are not called—and imagined a duty and power which God never instituted. They ought now candidly to admit that they have tried to wreath round the brows of perishable man the immortal glories of that great High-priest whose priesthood is an incommunicable priesthood, and whose sacrifice was offered once for all for the sins of an undone world.

My learned antagonist travelled out of his way to comment on the priest's investiture with the power of forgiveness of sins, in order to vindicate the sacrificial assumptions

of the Roman Catholic priesthood. He admitted and distinctly declared that the priests do judicially forgive sins; and in pleading for this claim—this judicial power of the priests to forgive sins—he said it showed their dignity, and the exalted nature of their office and appointment, in thus being able to forgive the sins of others. Now, recollect, Mr. French asserted that the priests do judicially forgive sins, and that this fact of their power of forgiveness of sins, so far from being a diminution of their dignity, shows it is something like that of the priesthood of Christ—they *judicially* forgive sins. To show that my opponent is right, I go to the Council of Trent, and I find the synod also teaches “that even priests who are bound with mortal sin exercise, as the ministers of Christ, the power of remitting sins by the power of the Holy Ghost conveyed to them in ordination; and that those persons err in their opinion who contend that wicked priests have not this power. But, although a priest’s absolution is the dispensation of a benefit conferred by another, yet it is not a *mere naked act of ministry*, in announcing the Gospel, or declaring that the sins are remitted; but is like a JUDICIAL ACT, IN WHICH SENTENCE IS PRONOUNCED BY HIM AS BY A JUDGE.”—Can. vi. *on Repentance*. (Council of Trent.)

Now, here is the verdict of the Council of Trent. The priest forgives *judicially*, and not *ministerially* only. You observe—

MR. FRENCH.—Both!

REV. J. CUMMING.—Both. The greater includes the lesser.

MR. FRENCH.—Certainly, decidedly!

REV. J. CUMMING.—He admits both, therefore he admits *judicially*—I deny the judicial power. I believe it, along with the “divine,”

the “glorious,” the “splendid” St. Augustine, to be a blaspheming assumption: “And what did the Jews say? Who is this that forgives sins also? Does man dare to usurp to himself this power? What, on the other hand, does the *heretic* say? *I forgive—I cleanse—I sanctify*. Let Christ, and not myself, answer him: O man, when I was thought by the Jews to be simply man, I gave the forgiveness of sin to faith. It is not I, it is Christ, who answers you. O heretic! you are but man, and you say, Approach, O woman! I will save thee; but I, when I was thought to be a man, said, Depart, O woman! thy faith hath saved thee. They answer, as the apostle says, ignorant of the things of which they talk and which they affirm—they answer and say, If men do not forgive sins, then what Christ says is false; Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Ye are ignorant wherefore this was said, and how it was said. The Lord was about to give the Holy Spirit to men, and he wished it to be understood that sins were remitted to believers by the Holy Spirit himself, and not by the merits of men. For what are you, O man! but a sick person about to be healed? Do you wish to be a physician to me? Come with me, and seek the physician; for the Lord, in order to show more evidently, namely, that sins were remitted by the Holy Spirit which he gave to his believers, and not by the merits of men, thus says, in a certain passage, when he had risen from the dead, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” he immediately added, “whosoever sins ye remit, are remitted;” that is to say, it is the Spirit who remits, and not you. But the Spirit is God—GOD THEREFORE REMITS, AND NOT YOU.”—*St. August. on Luke vii.*; Sermon 99, vol. v. p. 525.

Mr. FRENCH. — Certainly, certainly!

Rev. J. CUMMING.—The SPIRIT remits, not YOU. Observe, the statement of St. Augustine is most explicit, viz. that "HE" (GOD) remits sins JUDICIALLY, and not that the PRIEST JUDICIALLY remits sin. The whole argument, you observe, between us is this: he says it is *judicially*, we say, *ministerially* only.

Mr. FRENCH.—It is both!

Rev. J. CUMMING.—We ministerially proclaim Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" but the priests of the Church of Rome assume also judicial functions, and judicially forgive the sins of those who come to them as judges, as it is asserted in the canon of the Council of Trent.—I am compelled by my opponent again to call your attention to the word *λειτουργικὸς*; I have shown you that if *λειτουργικὸς* means *sacrificing* the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Son of God on the altar, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and dead, it must also be implied that kings, and rulers, and angels, have a call and right to do the same, as their functions are in Scripture called *λειτουργικά*. This leads to results the most monstrous, more so by far than Transubstantiation.—My antagonist repeated his asseverations that the fathers call the Mass a sacrifice. I have no objection to call the Eucharist a sacrifice, as I have repeated over and over again. I do not shrink from this expression. What I dissent from is, your calling it "a propitiatory sacrifice, an *unbloody propitiatory* sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."—My opponent next turned your attention to the propriety of Mary being called "the Mother of God." You remember I quoted Dupin, the celebrated Roman

Catholic historian, for ample authority as to the post-apostolical origin of this phrase. But when he contends that the Scripture expression "Mother of my Lord," means necessarily "Mother of my God," then, while holding in the fullest and amplest sense the eternal Deity of the Son of God, I do declare that the expression "Mother of my Lord" does not necessarily prove her to be "Mother of my God." For if it does, Mr. French must believe that Abraham was GOD, because we read in 1 Peter iii. 6, "Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, *calling him Lord.*" The very same expression, you observe. He says the expression "Lord" necessarily involves the essential Deity, but we find the expression "Lord" applied in Scripture to Abraham, and I therefore assert that, on such a supposition, Mr. French must believe that Abraham was called God by Sara.—My learned opponent next accused me of using blasphemous language—language so bad that certain Roman Catholics left the room, and refused again to attend. I solemnly protest against this aspersion which is so recklessly cast upon me. I have used, throughout this discussion, the very language of the canon of the Council of Trent, the language of the catechism of the Council of Trent; and if the inferences which I deduce from their language necessarily involves blasphemy, let my friend lay the guilt of blasphemy on the Church who invented so monstrous a phraseology, and concocted so foul a theology, not on the faithful annalist of the corruptions of both, who merely drags them forth from their concealment, and brings them before the burning light of God's most sacred oracles. Now, he has also complained, first, that I do *not* reply to the matter he brought forward, and,

secondly, he complains that I *do* reply. I really cannot understand what my learned friend would be at.

You have heard much this evening, as well as on a former, respecting that most important fact (in the estimate of my friend, Mr. French) that if the Mass be not a true and a scriptural dogma, how comes it to pass that not only the Church of Rome, but the schismatic churches, the Syrian, the Armenian, and Greek churches, have all retained it as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead? He says, How comes it to pass that these churches, who separated from the Roman, have retained it? Now, I wish that I could give him some satisfactory account of still more extraordinary things that have happened in the world. How, for instance, shall I account for the fact, that in the years that immediately preceded the flood, corruption and crime had so overspread the habitable globe, that when God looked down from heaven on the guilty earth, he declared, that "every imagination of the thought of men's hearts was evil continually?" and I ask him how that came to pass? He has asked me how it came to pass that the corrupt tenet has been retained and interwoven with the rituals of the schismatic churches, and how it came to pass that it so extensively overspread the world, if it were not a sound, and originally a scriptural dogma? I ask, in return, how it came to pass that, ere the waters of the flood had well subsided, and ere the wrecks of that overwhelming judgment had disappeared, men began to build the tower of Babel, and menaced from its forts defiance to the name of the Most High? How did it come to pass that, after clear and audible revelations given by God to the descendants of Noah and his ser-

vants, Abraham, the patriarch of the yet young world, seemed alone to be "faithful amid the faithful few," all around him being plunged in idolatry? Nay, more: I ask how it came to pass that, after the impressive spectacles of Sinai—after the stupendous judgments, and yet more stupendous mercies, witnessed by the children of Israel, no sooner had the thunder on Sinai's hill been hushed, and the lightning flame disappeared, than they fell down prostrate, and, forgetful of Jehovah, worshipped the "golden calf," which their own hands and fingers had fashioned? I ask, also, how it came to pass (for I require an explanation of all this) that the schismatic Church of Samaria retained the same idolatry which the true Church of Judah had also fallen into? When my antagonist has given an explanation of these multitudinous facts, I shall give an explanation of the (to my opponent) marvellous fact, that the same corrupt tenet spread like a contagion through all the schismatic churches during the ages that succeeded those of the apostles.

There are, however, three reasons which I can give you for my opponent's marvellous fact. First, the dark ages—ages in which ignorance wrapped almost all mankind in a thick and impenetrable mantle. Secondly, the corruption of the priests; and I am prepared to bring historic and decisive documents to show that their corruption was so gross, that licentious indulgences, and other abominable frauds, arose out of it, to an awful and unprecedented extent. A third reason I assign for the spread of this tenet, was the spirit of proselytism, and the seductive arts put forth and exercised by the Roman Catholic Church—the efforts, in short, made by her in every shape to make proselytes to her principles. If no

intercourse had been between Rome and the schismatic churches, the maintenance of the dogma by all would be most remarkable; but the intercourse between Rome and the surrounding nations of the world is known to have been so great, that the same dogma might spread from her to the remotest schismatic churches with the utmost rapidity and ease. When we know that this intercourse with Rome was unrestrained and almost uninterrupted; when we recollect that for centuries, during the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth, she had Latin patriarchs at Jerusalem and at Constantinople, at Alexandria and Antioch; when we recollect the amalgamating influence exerted by the crusades over the whole of Europe; when we recollect that Pope after Pope left unemployed no weapon (little minding the holiness of that weapon) and passed by no opportunity (not minding the lawfulness of that opportunity); when we know all this, not on Protestant, but Papal authority, as my opponent will find by referring to the Romish annalist, Renaldus, it is easy to account for the extensive spread of the idolatrous dogma, and for its being taken up by the schismatical children who imbibed their notions from their heretic mother. While I state this universality of the influence of corruption, this wide-spread degeneracy of the time, and departure from the faith, we cannot but think of the Apocalyptical Church "who made all the nations drink of the wine of her fornication."

The argument, I may observe, above drawn from the schismatic churches, is only an old argument, clothed with a certain freshness, and pointed by the peculiar logic of my learned friend; and as I have been referred for more, to the pages of Dr. Wiseman, I beg to return

the kindness by directing my learned friend to Claude's Reply to Arnault, in which, among other wholesome lessons, he will find his argument discussed and dismissed, with very marked evidence of its worthlessness.—My antagonist, after this referred us to those *soi-disant* ancient liturgies of which he has spoken so sadly and so much. I showed that Dupin gives many powerful and irresistible reasons against their claims to be apostolical. We have seen that they are not apostolical, from Protestant and Roman Catholic testimony; on the contrary, that they are forgeries of the fourth and fifth centuries. This settles their worth as evidence.—I referred next to the words of Justyn Martyr, giving an account of a Christian sabbath's worship, in which there is not one syllable, by implication or otherwise, about the Mass, or the elevation and adoration of the Host, or any other of the marked and the prominent peculiarities of the doctrine. In the next place, so decisive is the Word of God (as I showed you last evening, when I went over the seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews), so decisive is the word of God against oftentimes repeated sacrifice, and the many priests and the many sacrifices which cannot take away sin, that if there were ten thousand liturgies that supported the Mass, and one single chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews that disclaimed and disproved it, the ten thousand liturgies would be false, and that single chapter would be eternally true. Observe, however, that the whole weight and worth of these liturgies is not quite *sub judice*; it is scarcely a *veraxa questio*. They would, if unanimous for the Mass, weigh but a feather in the scale against the word of God; but I do not concede that feather.

But to furnish my antagonist,

once for all, with the right mode of interpreting the fathers, I will submit the following facts and references, in order to cast light on the interpretation of those fathers which my antagonist brought forward, and which will be of essential service as a guide in his future interpretation. In the first place, I maintain, what I shall prove by and by from themselves, that the fathers *GENERALLY use the sign for the thing signified*. I say *GENERALLY*; and if you convict them from this habit of believing in Transubstantiation and in the Mass, you will have to convict Dr. Watts, the Independent, and every one singing Dr. Watts' hymns, of believing in the same doctrine; for you find in those hymns expressions as much in favour of Transubstantiation as any passages in the fathers: I quote,

Hymn vi. b. 3.

The Lord of life this table spread,
With his own flesh and dying blood.

Hymn xvii. b. 3.

This soul-reviving wine,
Dear Saviour, is thy blood:
We thank that sacred flesh of thine
For this immortal food.

Hymn xviii. b. 3.

And here we drink our Saviour's blood,
We thank thee, Lord, 'tis generous wine;
Mingled with love, the fountain flowed,
From that dear bleeding heart of thine.

Hymn xix. b. 3.

Thy blood, like wine, adorns thy board,
And thine own flesh feeds every guest.

Hymn xxi. b. 3.

Now you must triumph at my feast,
And taste my flesh and blood.

Hymn xxiii. b. 3.

Sitting around our Father's board,
We raise our tuneful breath;
Our faith beholds her dying Lord,
And dooms our sins to death.
We see the blood of Jesus shed,
Whence all our pardons rise;
The sinner views th' atonement made,
And loves the sacrifice.

Will my Independent friends admit that they believe in Transubstantiation? They spurn it as an unscriptural dogma, and yet the fathers

do not use stronger language. Will my Baptist friends admit a belief in Transubstantiation, as one of their tenets? No; they spurn it as an unscriptural dogma also. Will our Wesleyan brethren recognise the tenet of Transubstantiation? No; they treat its claims with kindred contempt; and yet I will defy you to find throughout the writings of the fathers stronger language than that employed in the hymns of the excellent and pious Dr. Watts. If you adopt Mr. French's mode of interpreting the fathers—of interpreting Scripture, you will not only land in the most monstrous results—such as that “all flesh *is* grass”—or meaning according to his principle, all the individuals in this room are become blades of grass, instead of being living men and women, but you will bring Scripture and the fathers too into complete disrepute. If you wish, I declare, to propagate infidelity at the most rapid ratio throughout the world, you have only to adopt the principles of interpretation which Mr. French contends for. But if you pursue the mode of interpretation which I conceive to be at once natural and intended, namely, that the fathers *use the sign for the thing signified*, you will find that there is harmony where all was furious discord, and common sense in the word of God where, on the other plan, it was not before; and you will ascertain that the fathers, instead of being all mad fanatics and wild enthusiasts, were some of them really reasonable men.

But I am happy to announce, that I have discovered in one of the fathers the *KEY* to the interpretation of the rest. In the first place, I shall read an extract from ISIDORE, on his mode of interpreting Scripture. He gives the very same common sense explanation which

suggested itself to me before. This extract, which I translate from the original Latin, gives a most satisfactory explanation of the strong language of the fathers, out of which my opponent wiredraws, by literary butchery, "the immortal dogma" Transubstantiation. He was one of the fathers of the seventh century.

"Wherefore, Scripture calls it the spirit of Samuel, because images are wont to be called by the names of those things of which they are images. Thus, all things painted or sculptured are called by the names of those very things of which they are resemblances, and the proper name is unhesitatingly given; and it is said—that is Cicero, that is Sallust, that is Achilles, that is Hector, this is the river Simois, although they are nothing else than the painted images. The representations of the cherubim, though celestial powers, being made of metal, which God commanded to be placed above the ark, were also called cherubim. So when one has a dream, he does not say I saw the picture of Augustine, but I saw Augustine; though, at the moment of this sight, Augustine was ignorant of anything of the kind. So obvious is it that the images of the men, and not the men themselves, are seen. Thus Pharaoh said he saw ears of corn and kine in his dream, not the representations of ears of corn and kine."—*Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Commentar. in Lib. I. Regum. c. xx.* Paris, 1601.

Now, observe, here is an extract from Isidore, speaking the language of the seventh century. This father virtually declares that, in reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the fathers of the centuries that preceded him called the sign by the name of the thing signified. Remember, this is from one of the FATHERS, and therefore, if this passage from

the writings of an ancient father proves, that, in the wonted language of the times, in reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the symbol is called by the name of the thing signified, how will Transubstantiation stand, even in the presence of Isidore and the fathers, not to speak of the apostles?

Now, the next quotation which I shall make, explanatory of the language of the ancient fathers on the Eucharist, is from the divine and glorious St. Augustine (as Mr. French calls him), from his Epistle, 98, vol. ii. p. 267:—"For we frequently so express ourselves that, when Easter is approaching, we say, To-morrow, or the day after to-morrow, *is the Lord's passion*: when he suffered so many years before, and that passion only once for all took place. Moreover, on the Lord's day, we say To-day the Lord rose again: when so many years are passed since his resurrection. For surely, no one is so foolish as to contend that we, speaking thus, have lied, because we call those days after the likeness of the days on which those things took place; so that is called the very day which is not the very day, but in the *lapse of time resembles it*. And *that is said to take place on that day on account of the celebration of the sacrament, which did not occur on that day, but long ago*" (this is the explanation of the origin of the Mass). "Was not Christ in his own person ONCE sacrificed, and yet in the sacrament is he not sacrificed for the people, not only during all the solemnities of Easter, but every day; nor does he lie, who, being questioned, answers, that he is sacrificed. FOR IF THE SACRAMENTS HAD NOT A CERTAIN LIKENESS OF THOSE THINGS OF WHICH THEY ARE SACRAMENTS, THEY WOULD CEASE ALTOGETHER TO BE SACRA-

MENTS. BUT ON ACCOUNT OF THIS LIKENESS THEY RECEIVE FOR THE MOST PART THE NAME OF THE THINGS THEMSELVES. As, therefore, after a certain fashion, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith. . . . As the apostle says, concerning baptism itself, 'we have been buried together with Christ, by baptism unto death.' He does not say we have signified a burial, but he says at once, we have been buried together with him. He *called therefore the sacrament of so great an event by nothing else but the name of the thing itself.*"—Augustine's Letter to Bishop Boniface, epistle 98, vol. ii. p. 267.

Now, I have given you these two most important passages from the fathers—one from Isidore, in reference to the language employed and set forth in the Scriptures, and another from Augustine as to the language used by the Church. These two explain in the clearest manner the principle by which you are to be guided in interpreting the fathers. And therefore, the inference is, that in the fathers, according to the testimony of AUGUSTINE, and according to the testimony of ISIDORE, the *symbol* is called by the thing *signified*; and hence their strong and startling phraseology, which my friend has tried to construe into the doctrine of Transubstantiation, evaporates into "thin air," instead of condensing into "the immortal dogma of Transubstantiation."

It does, Mr. Chairman, seem to me a most extraordinary fact, that Mr. French should so pertinaciously shrink from meeting those Mass-exterminating statements which I repeated and reiterated from the Epistle to the Hebrews. If a man's cause is to be judged by the nature

of his witnesses, *his* cause will present itself to your minds with meagre and miserable claims. To defend himself he has adduced divers schismatic churches as his witnesses—he has appealed for protection and support to the Greek Church—he has applied to the Baptists to help him—he has flung himself and his Church among the Independents; and, lastly, he has rushed for shelter to the Church of Scotland. My learned opponent ran to every nook and corner under heaven, crying in agony, "Pray take me in, for I find the Word of God drives me out; I must find shelter somewhere, for this 'Calvinist' has no mercy." He has applied to Greeks and schismatics, to seraphic doctors and to Protestant divines—to Churchmen and to Dissenters—but all reject him. I have cross-questioned all his witnesses, his choicest witnesses; and they contradict each himself, and each his neighbour, or will have nothing to do with him. My opponent loves to bask beneath the pale and sickly light emitted from the fathers, and to present his questionable wares amid the flickering glow-worm light that streams from their lamps; but most ignobly does he refuse to bring them forth to the scrutiny and gaze of this assembly beneath the blazing sunshine that pours out from the oracles of God.

He reminds me in this respect of a shrewd and sagacious Jew, who was anxious to dispose of a piece of common crystal as a rare and valuable jewel. He took care to proclaim this piece of cut glass as a precious gem of "the first water," but at the same time managed never to bring it out to public view at mid-day. He preferred the dusk of the evening, or still better, candle light. [Laughter]. He knew the laws of reflection and refraction sufficiently to enable him to foresee that hun-

dreds would believe it a valuable jewel by candle light, who, beholding it amid the clear noon-day light, would give the impostor in charge, and not only perceive but proclaim the disreputable fraud. I want my learned opponent to shun the practice of the Jew in this discussion. Bring forth this dogma from the glow-worm light of at best the contradictory and cloudy fathers, and place it beneath the glorious sunshine of the Sun of Righteousness, as it streams with undying splendour from the oracles of truth; and if it will not bear *that* test, depend upon it it is not given by the inspiration of God. Evil and error only prefer darkness to light.

After my friend had run the round of schismatic churches, and cowered under the wing of contradictory fathers and persecuting doctors, and, in every instance, had either knocked his head against stone walls, or been turned out *sans ceremonie*—after he had run to our Baptist and Independent friends, who differ from me on ecclesiastical establishments, to hide his head among them, and had heard from their lips the withering reply, We'll have nothing to do with you and your traditions: "the BIBLE, and the BIBLE alone," is our rule of faith;—after this desperate run, my learned opponent looked perfectly bewildered. He seemed to be in the plight of some poor sailor doomed to walk the plank, receiving a buffet from every hand as he passes, till at length he plunges into a sea of tempestuous froth, and disappears. [Laughter.] My opponent referred to the sacrifices under the Jewish economy, as *typical* or illustrative of the Mass, the Roman Catholic propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. Let it be remembered, that while the Mass is defined "a PROPITIATORY sacrifice

for the sins of the living and the dead," it is nevertheless "an *unbloody* sacrifice." A glance at any of the sin-offerings under the law will convince us that their inscription, legible as if written in light, was, "Without shedding of blood no remission of sins." Let us refer to the Paschal or Passover Lamb—surely it was not an unbloody sacrifice. It was required by God, that the *blood* of the Lamb should be sprinkled upon the lintels and door posts of the houses of the children of Israel, at that time in Egypt; and they were told that when the destroying angel should "spread his wings on the blast," and sweep on strong pennon from the palace to the cottage through the length and breadth of startled Egypt, breathing death upon the first-born of Rahab, from Pharaoh on the throne to the meanest subject—the inmates of the *blood-besprinkled* habitations should be safe. Hence it came to pass, that the only sheltered and sacred few were those who believed in, and trusted to, the *bloody* sacrifice—who had sprinkled its (the victim's) blood upon the lintels and the door posts. Egypt's *unbloody* offerings presented no shelter; Israel's *bloody* sacrifice proved better than bulwarks and battlements. And *you*, my dear Roman Catholic friends, if you will but have recourse to "*the once-for-all Sacrifice*," offered on the accursed tree, and by *faith* sprinkle that precious blood upon the inward "lintels" of the heart, then when the angel of the second death, armed with more than the vengeance of Sinai, shall pass through the length and breadth of this dismantled world, the shrieks of woe and the wailings of despair which shall pour forth from amidst the devouring slaughter of the world's first-born shall sound in your ears like sacred accents—

like tones of melody significant of anutterable glory—and that ocean which becomes the sepulchre of earth's most illustrious Pharaohs, shall form a bright and beauteous promenade for the redeemed of the Most High. [Strong sensation.]

I must produce another reference to the nature of sacrifice, from the scape-goat in Leviticus, xvi. 15, 22. We find that, after the priest had covered the altar with the cloud of incense, he slew one goat, and sprinkled *its blood* upon the mercy seat, thus proving that blood-shedding was an essential concomitant of accepted and *propitiatory* sacrifice. He next took another goat, on the head of which Aaron laid both hands, within the vail, and confessed the sins of Israel over it; and the goat was then sent away by the hand of a fit man into the lonely and uninhabited wilderness—"the land of forgetfulness"—and the sins of the people were no more remembered. Here again salvation was through a bloody sacrifice. Now, we want you to do this, my Roman Catholic hearers, with the sacrifice of Christ. Take his *blood*, by faith, and sprinkle it on your hearts and your consciences, pleading its efficacy before God; lay your hands, by faith, upon his sacred head, confess your sins over him, seek forgiveness by his bloody sacrifice, and all your iniquities will be buried in the sea of God's mercy—borne to the land of forgetfulness, and no more remembered at all. Every blessing in the promises is by *blood*. I find it recorded in the Bible, that we have acceptance through his blood, that we have forgiveness through his blood, "redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins." We find purification through his blood, even "the cleansing from all sin;" we find *access* to the Father through

his *blood*, by "a new and a living way;" we find *victory* through his *blood*—"they overcame by the blood of the Lamb;" we find *fitness* for heaven through his *blood*, for "these are they who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." I ask you, then, *what else* can you desire? Do you want *pardon*? it is found in Christ's *blood*, infinitely for you all; do you want *forgiveness*? it is found in his *blood*, richly, freely for you all; do you want *victory*? it is even Christ who giveth you the victory, and through him we are "*more* than conquerors;" do you want *access* to a throne of grace? it is found in Christ's blood for "the chiefest of sinners" in "the once-for-all sacrifice for sins," the Just bleeding in the room of the unjust.

Let it also be remembered, how entire and real is the fitness of the blood of Christ to do all this. It was required, before forgiveness could possibly be extended, that there should be *suffering* and *satisfaction*. Man could *suffer*, but man could not *satisfy*: God could *satisfy*, but God is impassible, and cannot *suffer*; and therefore God and man were mysteriously united into one, combining the suffering of man and the satisfaction of God, and forming that perfect Saviour in whose bloody sacrifice we obtain mercy and forgiveness. God in Christ *has come so near* to me that I can see him, hear him, handle him, receive him, believe in him; and yet he *remains so holy* that the whole godhead may be seen to dilate in every feature, infinity to unfold itself in every act, and the majesty of heaven to burn in every thought and beam forth in every lineament of that incarnate Lord [renewed sensation]; and, my friends, if this, in verity, be the fact, if we have so *perfect*—so *complete*—so *fit* a Saviour—adequate

in all respects to our condition and our wants, *what can be the use of the Mass?* What is the use of an *unbloody* sacrifice additional to this? in which, if God's Word is truth, there can be *no remission, no possibility of forgiveness!* The Scriptures assert, that in Christ "there is *full forgiveness*"—what want we more?—that he is made unto us "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and complete redemption." Scripture asserts, that his "riches are unsearchable, his mercy infinite and without end."

And now, my dear friends, I implore you to flee for mercy to this all-perfect Saviour—this precious blood—this alone propitiatory sacrifice. Place not your trust, I beseech you, in the wretched fancies of fallible and guilty mortality! If the Mass be a "*propitiatory* sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead," what need could there be of the agonies of the cross—the sufferings of Gethsemane—and the gloom of the grave? I have proved it "a blasphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit." It is a bramble, that will sting you, but will not shelter you. Like "Jonah's gourd," it may give you the momentary peace and exhilaration of a night under its ephemeral foliage; but when the terrible morning of eternity shall swallow up the shades of time, it will wither as a flower beneath the baleful simoom, and leave you shelterless, save by the freezing shadows of despair, and amid the stormy terrors of the judgment. But Christ is that fruitful and spreading vine, whose branches extend over the face of the firmament itself, and under which all nations are destined to find repose, refreshment, and peace. He is that "Rock of ages," on which if the sinner build, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against him." The *Mass*—miserable mi-

miery of truth!—is but a lamp without oil, a bone without marrow, a type without an antitype, a system unilluminated by a sun. It is a *vox et præterea nihil*. If you speak to it, it cannot answer—if you pray to it, it cannot help you—if you lean on it, like a treacherous reed it will give way—if you put your trust in it, it will deceive you; but if you pray to Christ, he will sustain you—if you go to his bosom, and seek rest within his eternal embrace, "neither life, nor death, nor principalities, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate you from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus your Lord."

My dear Roman Catholic friends, in looking to the Mass for pardoning mercy and eternal life, you are looking for bread in a sack of chaff, for "grapes on thistles;" like the prodigal, you are feeding "on the husks that the swine should eat," instead of the true bread that can satisfy the wants of hungry and immortal souls: in seeking salvation from the Mass, you are searching for truth amid falsehood—for the living among the dead. [Sensation.] Oh! tell me not, my friends, of its splendour, its pomp, and its ceremony. These may cheat your senses, but they cannot save your guilty souls. Do not gratify sense at the risk of hell. Its truthfulness or its erroneousness is a matter of life eternal, or of death eternal. Let no syrens charm you to ruin. I call on you to burst through every obstacle obstructing your path to truth—and, as the warriors in David's army, when David and his soldiers were athirst, rushed onward through the ranks of opposing Philistines, and drank of the well of Bethlehem—even so must you break away from the repressive influences of the best

and the dearest to your hearts, and, at all hazards and at every sacrifice, reach the living waters that flow from the Rock of ages, and refresh yourselves with them, that you may no more thirst, but find them wells "within you, springing up to everlasting life." I call on you to rise, like Samson, from the lap of Rome, that wanton and voluptuous Dalilah, and, bursting the bonds of her tyranny and the snares of her enchantment, assert your *right* to the number of those "freemen whom the *truth* makes free." Hear the voice of the Son of God, who, in his own tones of majesty, said, "Lazarus, come forth!" and from that moment corruption shall start into beauty—death shall quicken into life, and the deep and dismal superstition in which you have been so long entombed shall explode, and the living light of glorious day shine into the chambers of your souls. Hear the voice of the Son of God, saying to every victim of error, "*Come forth!*" and though the bandages are left on your eyes, and the cerecloth trappings of the tomb be bound about your limbs, and a mountain load of guilt press upon your souls, yet the same voice which said, "COME FORTH" will cause mountains to give way, will unloose your bands, and let you taste the sweets of Protestant and sanctified freedom.

I call your attention, in concluding, to one solitary text, applicable, because destructive, to the Mass; it is embodied in three words, but those three words alone are enough to sink the Mass into the depths of a sea of shame. But before I do so, as I have just recollected another reference and semblance of argument, I must very briefly advert to it, if only to satisfy Mr. French. He adduced Malachi i. 11, as a proof of the Mass. The word is

not mentioned in this text, nor anything to intimate the existence or characteristic features of the Mass.

"For from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathens, saith the Lord of Hosts."

In the Douay, or Roman Catholic version, it is as follows:—

"For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is *sacrifice*, and there is offered to my name a *clean oblation*, for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts."

He says the word "*sacrifice*," which is the Douay rendering, means the Sacrifice of the Mass. Now I demand evidence, not *ipse dixit*, for this. I quoted Scripture passages which describe this sacrifice, telling him "the sacrifices of God are a broken and contrite spirit," and Heb. xiii. 15, 16:—"By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise, continually. To do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Rom. xii. 1:—"Present your bodies living sacrifices."

These, I assert from Scripture evidence, are the various sacrifices which Malachi alludes to. Where, I ask, in the New Testament, are any of them referred to the Mass? My friend says it is the Mass. He cannot produce one New-Testament text which declares that it is the Mass; which is no mean disproof of his assertion. I have produced several texts which show that spiritual sacrifices are the only sacrifices offered up by "the kings and priests to God" of the New Testament

economy. In this passage the two Hebrew words are מִקְטָר and מִנְחָה; *Miktar*, rendered by the Douay, most improperly, "sacrifice,"—by our version, most correctly, "incense," as Gesenius testifies, who defines it a "burning of incense;" and *Mincha*, rendered, well enough, in the Douay, "oblation," or, in our version, "offering." In reference to the first, *Miktar*, the Church of Rome renders it "sacrifice" in this verse, where she has a purpose to serve, but in Exodus xxx. 1, where she can have none, she properly renders it "incense." Why this distinction? Why "sacrifice," most unscholar-like, in one place, and "incense," correctly, in another? In Exodus xxx. 7, "sweet-smelling incense" is the just rendering of the Hebrew according to the Douay, and also of the Greek *θυμίαμα*. The Church of Rome, destitute of any evidence for the Mass, has perverted and mistranslated this text. She refuses to bring her dogmas to God's word. She prefers to torture God's word to suit her superstition. The other word, מִנְחָה, is rendered fairly in her version, but it never can refer to the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, for in Isaiah lxvi. 20, the very same Hebrew word is rendered "gift" in the Douay Bible, and is applied to *persons*, who are not, surely, transubstantiated into the Mass? Isaiah, lxvi. 20 (Douay version), "And they shall bring all your brethren out of all nations, for a gift to the Lord" (כִּנְחָה לַיהוָה). The word is applied to "a meat and drink offering" and accompanied certain sacrifice, as may be seen in Lev. ii. 1, 4, 5, 11. It never meant propitiatory sacrifice, or was typical of the Mass. It is asked, how there can be a clean offering, if not the Mass? The Greek word in the Septuagint is καθάρως, (*clean*) and hence the

offering is clean in the same sense in which the offerers are clean. John xv. 3.—"Now are ye *clean* through the word which I have spoken to you." The offering and offerer are clean through the blood and intercession of Christ.

I have already shown you that *Tertullian* (*Against the Jews*, p. 188. Paris, 1675,) expressly declares it to be sacrifices spiritual, not propitiatory: "Thus, therefore, spiritual sacrifices are meant, and a *contrite heart* is shown to be an acceptable sacrifice to God;—that *Theodoret* (on Epist. to Heb. x. 795) declares, "Here is one and the same priest, and he effected the forgiveness of sins, and needs no other sacrifice;" and that Justyn knew nothing whatever of the Mass Sacrifice. I have shown you that the liturgies he quoted are, from internal evidence, and the testimonies of Dupin and Tilmont, historians of the Roman Catholic Church, downright forgeries of the fourth and sixth centuries, and his arguments from them as strong as if taken from Walter Scott's novels. I have shown that the Bible exterminates the Mass with more speed than the touch of Ithuriel's spear; and my opponent has not adduced one statement from that blessed book for the Mass which will bear to be looked at. If the Mass be not a *bloody* sacrifice, then, according to Scripture, there can be no propitiation for sins by it, and therefore the Council of Trent speaks without truth, and anathematizes without charity. There is but *one* Priest who made propitiation under the New Testament, and ever liveth, although believers are called spiritual priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifice; and therefore the proud claims and very existence of the priests of the Church of Rome are a grievous inflection on earth.

Having thus cursorily glanced at all my friend has said, as I have refuted it again and again, I now recur to a text of three words which rings the DEATH-KNELL OF THE MASS—and these words our Lord uttered on the cross, as recorded in John xix. 30, when he bowed his head to die:—"IT IS FINISHED!" Then death was spoiled of its sepulchered treasures, and denuded of his iron tyranny over the faithful in Christ. Sin, its sting, was then exhausted for ever; then the bars of the grave were burst open, and the sheeted dead arose the first fruits to God and to immortality; then, the cup of God's red wrath against sin placed in his hands, which we, without him, should have had to drink throughout all eternity, the Son of God emptied to its very dregs, and replenished with eternal blessings, so that there remained not one drop of wrath, "no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," when he said, "IT IS FINISHED!" All types are now merged in the glorious anti-type; all prophecies fulfilled—all significant ceremonial scattered, for "IT IS FINISHED!" Robes of righteousness washed in his tears, and made perfect in his shed blood, are ready. There is a righteousness for you all, so pure, so perfect, that a martyr's best blood would defile it, and a saint's purest tears would blemish and bedim it—a righteousness which can receive no addition from man, and no deterioration from devils: nothing that earth can do can add to its splendour, and nothing that Satan can try can depreciate its worth. The eye that detects spots in the azure heavens, and infirmities in the burning cherubim, sees no flaw in this garment. Arrayed in it, you stand before the Holy One "without spot or blemish, or wrinkle, or any such thing." It was woven by

the fingers, washed in the blood, sprinkled by the tears, and perfumed by the merits of God's incarnate Son. Hear me. It is free and is given gratis to you all. No *half-crowns* are required for it—no *pounds*, as for Masses. It is given to every guilty sinner that seeks it from Christ, "without *money* and without *price*." "Ye are saved through faith—not of yourselves—it is the gift of God." "IT IS FINISHED," and all propitiatory sacrifices are now completed; all the functions of the Aaronitic priesthood are come to a close; each hoary prediction is met—each sacred emblem illumined. The Baptist heralded his glory when it broke forth first in Palestine, and Christ himself at last announces his triumph and his entrance into glory when he uttered these words. Sin's iron sceptre was trampled on and overthrown; and therefore, wherever you behold a priest of the Church of Rome assuming and claiming *propitiatory* functions, let faithfulness and mercy prompt you to whisper in that priest's ear the thrilling tones—"IT IS FINISHED!" When you see the many priests of the Church of Rome offering up the many and oftentimes repeated sacrifices, which can never take away sin, Oh, whisper it affectionately in their ears, if peradventure it may sink deep into their hearts—"IT IS FINISHED!" "THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN." Christ is our indestructible Altar. Our Priest, Christ, never dieth—our Sacrifice, Christ, is, once for all, ever efficacious to the uttermost: all altars, in the strict sense, besides Christ, are blasphemous and useless. When you hear of poor Roman Catholics going to a priest of the Church of Rome to get absolution and forgiveness of sins, as a judicial act, reply, When Christ died, eternal absolution was obtained; for he said, "*It is*

finished!" In the beautiful words of the Douay Bible, "He *exhausted* sin," he made an end of sin, and brought in eternal righteousness. It is, therefore, my fervent and my heartfelt desire, that these words—"IT IS FINISHED!" may be emblazoned in the pages of the Missal, engraven on all the altars of the Roman Catholic Church—may reverberate throughout the dome of St. Peter, and return in piercing echoes from the chambers of the Vatican. I pray that these words—"IT IS FINISHED!" may be engraven on the heart of my learned antagonist, and on the hearts of his two reverend friends. "IT IS FINISHED"—there is no more need for Masses—no more need for propitiatory sacrifice of any kind. "We have a Saviour who has an unchangeable or intransmissible priesthood;" a

sacrifice of eternal efficacy, to which heaven and heaven's ambassadors beckon you. I implore you, my dear Roman Catholic hearers, to remember these words in all time of your wealth, in all time of your tribulation, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment:—"THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN; IT IS FINISHED!" [Strong sensation, which soon subsided, by reason of the dispersion of the meeting.]

[The reverend gentleman's hour here terminated.]

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

FIFTH EVENING, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1839.

SUBJECT :

INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND ANGELS.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—You are all perfectly aware that the subject propounded for discussion this evening is what is called the Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*. As I stated on a previous occasion, I had wished that my learned antagonist had commenced the discussion by laying before you a succinct and explicit account of the views entertained by his own church upon this question. However, by an arrangement previously made, it has devolved on me to open the discussion, and to explain, upon the one hand, what are the views of the PROTESTANT CHURCH on this subject, and, upon the other, what are the views of the Church of Rome. In

directing your attention to the Invocation of Saints, you are not for one moment to imagine that we Protestants would cast one single aspersion on the redeemed that are in the presence of the Lamb, or would depreciate by one solitary *iota* the convictions you may have of their holiness, and the happiness that flows from that holiness; I only feel that peril of momentous extent is near when even a saint is placed between Christ and the sinner, or when the one is located in the stead or in the room of the other.

My learned friend complained, you will remember, last evening, most bitterly, at my having the last speech. For the two first evenings

he had twice the last speech. It happened, however, by the rotation of last week, that I should have the disadvantage or advantage; and he actually deprecated, deplored, and almost wept over my having the last speech, reminding me of a poor school-boy afraid of the flogging which his master is about most severely to inflict upon him for his naughty behaviour. [Laughter.] All this, I must say, betrayed something excessively childish and ridiculous, and unworthy the talents and resources of my learned friend. Now to-night I congratulate *you* that you have the last speech [to Mr. F.]. My friend has the last speech to-night; instead, however of deeply deploring this, though I am satisfied when I have it, I rejoice, I am perfectly pleased with the arrangement. because I am sure, that when a mouse shall have bitten through a large file, or ground it to powder with its teeth, then my friend will have destroyed the scriptural arguments which I shall adduce upon the subject. [Laughter.] I do not at all deplore his having the last speech, because I am persuaded, that in this most glorious book there are so many, and so overwhelming arguments, that all the last speeches of a Bellarmine would be utterly unable to demolish or to neutralize them.

The doctrine of the PROTESTANT CHURCH may be explained to you in one single text taken from the Epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 18:—"THROUGH HIM WE HAVE ACCESS BY ONE SPIRIT TO THE FATHER." Here is the doctrine of the PROTESTANT CHURCH, that through the Lord Jesus Christ we have access, by the aid of one Holy Spirit, to the presence of God the Father. The doctrine, however, of the Church of Rome is of a very different character. *We* hold the saints in heaven to be holy and infinitely happy,

beyond the reach of tears, which so often bedim the eye in this lower world, inaccessible alike to sorrow and to death, which so often cast a blight over all that is bright and beautiful below; but we hold at the same time, that we most honour the saints, when we leave them to the uninterrupted enjoyment of their happy and their holy homes, and seem to magnify and to honour him, through whom the saints attained unto glory, in whose blood they have washed their robes, and made them white.

The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church (as on former occasions) I deduce, not from the writings of private doctors, nor from the opinions of my learned antagonist, but from the authorized and accredited documents and standards of the Church of Rome. I therefore read the Council of Trent on the *Invocation of Saints*. *Sess. xxv.* "The holy synod commands the bishops and others, who have the office and care of instruction, that according to the custom of the Catholic and apostolic Church, which has been received from the first ages of the Christian religion, the consent of the holy fathers, and the decrees of the sacred councils, they make it a chief point diligently to instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and Invocation of Saints, the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints, reigning together with Christ, offer to God their prayers for men; that it is good and useful to invoke them with supplication, and on account of the benefits obtained from God, through his Son Jesus Christ"—(they make it a chief point, mark you, diligently to instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and Invocation of Saints, the worship of relics, and the lawful use of images)—'but

they who deny that the same, enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invoking them that they may pray for each of us, is idolatry; or that it is contrary to the word of God, and opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and man; or that it is folly either BY WORD OR THOUGHT to supplicate them who are reigning in heaven, are impious in their opinions.

CANON. "If any shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed."

Those who assert that it is folly to pray to, *by word or thought*, or to supplicate, the saints reigning in heaven, are impious; that is to say, if my learned opponent, by word or in thought, or in heart, pray to St. Peter, or St. John, or St. James, or any other saint; and if I assert that it is a piece of perfect folly to pray to a saint in heart or in mind, the Council of Trent tells me it is an impious opinion. Roman Catholics, therefore, hold the opinion, you observe, that it is perfectly right to invoke the saints, not only by word but by thought.

I now read to you from Pope Pius the Fourth's Creed, to which every Roman Catholic subscribes. "And likewise that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated."

Now, I believe the Church of Rome does not attach the full meaning that persons read in the classics may attach to the words *veneror* and *invoco*. I find that, by classical references, *veneror* and *invoco* are used to denote "supreme worship," but the Church of Rome disclaims *Latria*, and holds that *veneror* and *invoco* denote here wor-

ship of *Doulia*, or inferior worship. Yet the words are not so used. Ovid says, *Nostraque fallaci veneratus numina cultu*: "Having worshipped or venerated our gods with counterfeit worship."

Cicero says, *Quem invocant omnes Jovem*: "Jupiter whom all call on and worship."

The use of these Latin words, you observe, in classic writers is calculated to mislead; but the Church of Rome attaches to them her own peculiar meaning. She says: The worship of *Latria* is to be given to God, and in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the Host; but the worship of *Doulia*, or an inferior worship, is to be given to saints. This is her explanation, which it is useful to keep before us. We admit, let me premise, that it is perfectly legitimate for one saint *upon earth* to solicit the prayers of another saint. I think it is perfectly Christian and perfectly scriptural, and in full consonance with apostolical practice, to ask of this assembly, (those who are PROTESTANTS and Christians indeed,) that they would pray for my learned opponent, that he may be turned from darkness to light, and brought to a knowledge of the glorious Gospel of the Son of God.

And, therefore, when my friend brings forward his arguments on the Invocation of Saints, take special notice whether *they apply to one saint on earth calling on another to pray for him on earth, or whether they apply to a saint on earth applying to a saint in heaven*. Now, I wish this distinction particularly to be impressed on your minds—that we hold it to be fully apostolical for me to ask you to pray for Mr. French, or for one saint to say to another, "Pray for me, that God would forgive my sins, and sanctify my heart, and strengthen and sustain

me by his mighty power;" and, therefore, you will watch my learned antagonist (who is so skilled in "special pleading" from his habits at the bar) lest he should confound, either by accident—for I am sure he would not do it wilfully—but by a slip—a *lapsus linguæ*—a saint on earth, asking another saint on earth to pray for him, and a saint on earth praying to a saint in heaven, that he would plead and intercede for him.

Now, the next point of caution which I give you, and to which I feel it important that I should direct your attention, is, it may be or it may not be—I have no wish to dispute the supposition—that saints in heaven pray for saints on earth, though I have nothing which leads me to believe it and no Scripture leads me to reject it; only you will remember that this question does not enter into the present subject of controversy—it may be that saints around the throne do lift up their prayers and their petitions for the martyrs that bleed and suffer upon earth, for the soldiers who contend for "the faith once delivered to the saints." I say it may be so; but whether so or not, is not the question. The question is not whether saints in heaven may intercede and plead for saints upon the earth, but (as defined in the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth) whether we *on earth* are to invoke, and venerate, and pray to the saints that are reigning *in heaven*. These are most important distinctions, because if you do not keep them clearly before you, you may be involved in some little confusion by my opponent confounding "the things which differ," or seeing no distinction upon points which are literally "wide as the poles" asunder. I do also trust that he will enter upon Scripture ground; at all events, if, according to his former custom, he take a deep

plunge into the fathers, I have a sufficient dose about the fathers in reserve for him; I expect his repetition of the practice. Let me add here, that the practice of my antagonist is exactly the *fac simile* of an experience of my own, when a pupil at a grammar school. Between school hours I sometimes went out fishing, and in some deep waters I was teased by eels in this way: when I thought the hook had caught the eel, and made sure of him as I dragged him up to the clear deep water, the fish instantly took a plunge, dived into the mud, and raised so great and turbid a commotion in the water that I could catch a glimpse of him no longer. [Laughter]. This is just the practice of my learned antagonist. When I have him by the hook and pull him upwards—the instant that I get him to the pellucid waters of the word of truth, he takes a plunge forthwith into the muddy waters of the fathers, and dives directly out of sight. [Laughter]. But I hope to-night he will appear in clear water, I trust he will show himself in the light of day; I hope he will bring the matter, not to the contradictory and conflicting fathers, who are anathematized (many of them) by the Council of Trent, and who have committed themselves on the most monstrous points; but to the grand standard which we admit in common—"THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY," for if it be not according to that, it is because there is no truth in it.

Our doctrine on the subject of saints, as well as on all forms of worship, is the apostolical and scriptural doctrine. Now, mark! ours, I say, is the ancient apostolical faith. I therefore require for proof apostolic documents. I will have nothing beneath this—I will have nothing contrary to this. All argu-

ments taken from any other source than from the pre-eminently apostolic fathers, the apostles and evangelists, I hold to be of no more value than the pattering of the rain-drops on the roof, or the rays of the sun that shine through the windows of this room; I say they are nothing to the subject. I will have none of these nineteenth century notions; no, not even sixteenth century notions—yea, none of these tenth century notions—I repudiate even the third century notions. I am of the ancient Church; I appeal to antiquity; I appeal to the apostles and evangelists; for theirs, and theirs alone, are the ancient and primitive views of the Church, and of the worship of the Church, as inspired by the Spirit of God. I repeat it, all modern innovations I utterly reject; all upstart opinions of the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, second, third, fourth, and fifth centuries I utterly repudiate. I must have an appeal made to those ancient and irrefragable standards, the apostles and evangelists, as they speak the oracles of God.

In looking at those standards, when I think of the immense space occupied in the worship of the Church of Rome by the names of saints, by their virtues, their merits, and the deeds they have performed, and when, on the other hand, I look at the word of God, I am perfectly surprised with the utter absence of anything like saint-Doulia, or saint-homage or worship. When I go to the word of God, I can find no parallel whatever to the saint-worship or saint-Doulia, that obtains in the usages and liturgies of the Roman Church. In the first place, looking at Scripture, I find most solemn warnings against forsaking “the fountains of living waters, and hewing out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.” I find the

most plain and explicit prohibition against trusting to “an arm of flesh,” followed by one of the most awful and solemn *anathemas* in the word of God:—“*Cursed is the man that trusteth in an arm of flesh.*” I find in the word of God, repeated, and most pressing reasons, for not worshipping the saints in heaven. I find, I say, explicit statements against worshipping the saints in heaven, and I moreover find a main charge brought against the whole heathen world, viz. that “they worshipped the creature,” or honoured and served the creature, “more than the Creator.” In short, from the *alpha* of Genesis to the *omega* of Revelations, I find one loud, simultaneous protest against trusting to “an arm of flesh,” and drinking from “broken cisterns,” against “serving or honouring the creature *beside or above* (*παρά*) the Creator.” I admit that the Church of Rome (as I have stated before) recognises a distinction between *Doulia* and *Latria*. Yet the words of Dr. Delahogue, are, “The worship of saints is a *religious* service.” I wish you particularly to remember, that Delahogue’s declaration is, that *religious* service is to be given to saints. Now, I admit the distinction she makes, and I perfectly comprehend the meaning she attaches to that distinction—but is it not rather a perilous position, that the fact, whether a man may be guilty of idolatry, or may worship the living and the true God, hangs on the scholastic splitting of a straw, on the mere delicate distinction of two Greek words which are used convertibly throughout the sacred Scriptures? To show you that these *two* words, namely, *Δουλεω*, the Greek verb, which Rome applies to saints, and *Δουλεια*, the Greek noun, which the Church of Rome applies to the worship of saints, are used to

denote the *highest possible worship* that can be given to the Almighty, I will quote the following passages of Scripture :—1 Thess. i. 9 : Αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὁποίαν εἰσοδὸν ἔχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀπο τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ : “ For they themselves show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to *serve* (or *worship* δουλεύειν) the living and true God.” Again, I quote Matthew vi. 24 : οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ : “ Ye cannot serve (or *worship*, δουλεύειν) God and mammon.” Again, I quote Romans xii. 11 : τῷ Κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες : “ Not slothful in business ; fervent in spirit, *SERVING* (or *worshipping*, δουλεύοντες) the Lord,”—the identical word, you observe, that the Church of Rome applies distinctively to the worship of saints.

Again, to prove this, I quote Eph. vi. 7 : Μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες (observe) τῷ Κυρίῳ : “ With good will *doing* SERVICE (with the understanding is meant, worshipping, or giving *Doulia* to the Lord) as to the Lord, and not to men.” So that, you see, while I admit that the Church of Rome does attach a modified meaning to *Doulia*, and that she applies *Latria* only to the loftiest kind of worship given to the Almighty, yet I do not admit that Scripture recognises any such distinction. We all of us allow that *civil homage* is to be paid to men, according to their ranks and their degrees in civil society. We admit that if an angel came down from heaven, radiant with all its unseen glories, and eloquent of all its highest and its holiest visions, that we should give that angel the highest possible *civil* homage that we could give to any creature ; but I would say, “ Let my right hand

forget its cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,” before I would fall down and worship that angel, or give him the remotest part of that worship which is God's.

There are some passages sometimes quoted by the Church of Rome, to which I will refer—which, however, like all passages she brings forward from the word of God, to elucidate her favourite dogmas, just militate the other way. When Cornelius the centurion came into the presence of Peter, Cornelius “ fell down to *worship* him.”—What was Peter's reply ? If Peter had been a Roman Catholic, he would instantly have said, “ You may, Cornelius, give me the worship of *Doulia*, only keep up a careful and exact distinction between *Doulia* and *Latria* ; that is, when you fall down to worship me, you may give me all the homage that is involved in *Doulia*, but you must not dare to give me an atom of the homage or the worship that is represented by *Latria*.” But was this the fact ? No. Peter was too sound and scriptural a PROTESTANT. He instantly replied to the centurion, “ Stand up, for *I also am a man* ;” (Acts x. 26.)—language which implies, that it is below the dignity, even of fallen man, to bow his knee and give religious worship to a creature. Another passage, quoted by the Church of Rome, is from the 19th chapter 10th verse of the Book of Revelations, where St. John says, when he saw the angel, “ I fell down at the feet of the angel.” Now, mark you, John was instructed in the truth of Christianity. If he had been a Roman Catholic, he would have known perfectly well that there is a distinction between *Latria* and *Doulia* ; and therefore Mr. French never will presume to assert that the apostle fell down and offered to

give the angel the worship of *Latria*. He must have offered the angel the worship of *Doulia*, knowing that the angel was a creature, though an exalted one. What was the angel's reply? Did he say worship me with *Doulia*? No; but, "See thou do it not: I am one of thy fellow-servants; worship God." Observe, then, I call upon Mr. French to give an explanation of this passage—"John fell down at the feet of the angel, intending to give him *Doulia*—(if he was a Roman Catholic, for an apostle never could have intended to give him the greater worship of *Latria*); but the reply of the angel was, "See thou do it not," i.e. do not worship me at all, either with *Latria*, or *Doulia*. I can almost anticipate the reply of my learned antagonist, and I will therefore give it him.

In the catechism of the celebrated Dr. Doyle, or rather the "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine," revised by Dr. Doyle, this very passage is quoted. In the fifty-second page of the "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine," revised by the Right Rev. James Doyle, D.D. we read: "*Quest.* Is it lawful to worship angels and saints? *Ans.* It is, with *Doulia*.—*Q.* How do you prove it? *A.* First, out of Joshua, v. 14, 15, where Joshua did it. Secondly, Apocalypse, xxii. 8, when St. John did it" (!!) (though the angel had once before willed him not to do it in regard of his apostolical dignity) "xix. 10. And I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things." There is a very curious explanation here, as to the circumstance that John *did* worship and as well as fell down to do it; but the angel said, "See thou do it not;" however, it seems (according to this) that John *did* it, though the angel commanded him not.

My antagonist speaks of "orientalism" and figures, and metaphors, and private expositions of texts! If ever there was an "oriental" and metaphorical interpretation of a text, it is this of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle. And, mark what follows this text, which the Doctor quotes for the worship of *Doulia* to angels (Rev. xix. 10.) "And he (the angel) saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God. And I fell at his feet to worship him." Here the Doctor stops. This is the close of Dr. Doyle's quotation of the text for the worship of *Doulia* to be given to angels and saints. The text, as I have said, is (Rev. xix. 10), beginning, "I fell down at his feet to worship him." But Dr. Doyle omits the remainder of the verse, which is its vital part, and is as follows: "SEE THOU DO IT NOT, I am thy fellow-servant; worship God." I know my learned antagonist will reprobate the conduct of Dr. Doyle; I know he will come to the conclusion that that Church is afraid of the light of heaven which would thus dare to tamper with the oracles of God—to bring forward a portion of a text that seems to militate in favour of a superstitious dogma, and to withhold that very portion of the text which at the same time declares that dogma to be unscriptural. The exposition given in the Douay Bible of the same passage, is—"St. Augustine is of opinion, that this angel appeared in so glorious a manner that St. John took him to be God, and gave him divine honour. St. Gregory thinks *he did not* offer him divine honour." By the bye, this is the *unanimity* of the fathers!! The "*glorious*" St. Augustine saying one thing, and the divine St. Gregory the reverse!—and yet, my friend professes in his creed that he will not interpret *one text* of the

Word of God unless according to the *unanimous* consent of the fathers!

The next passage which I shall adduce on this subject is from the Gospel of St. Matthew, 4th chapter, where you will recollect Satan said he would give Christ "all the kingdoms of the world, if he would fall down and worship him." Now, I do not dispute one moment whether the worship was of *Doulia* or *Latria*, for our Lord's reply seems to be utterly exclusive of the propriety of paying any religious worship or service to any creature whatever. "It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve." [A slight whispering on the platform.]

Rev. J. CUMMING (in continuation)—And the words (it is whispered to me) *Doulia* and *Latria* are both used in that very place. If this practice of the worship of saints (and I understand "*worship*" to be a correct translation of *Δουλεία*), if it be so profitable as the Council of Trent declares it to be, is it not a most extraordinary thing that the Trentine Council should be more discerning on what is conducive to the interests of man, than the omniscient God? Is it not a most extraordinary fact, that if this doctrine be so profitable to man, that in the whole word of God there is not one instance of a saint on earth invoking a saint in heaven, or one solitary command to the saints on earth to invoke and worship the saints that are in heaven? Is not this a strong presumption against the practice? I know there are quoted a few more passages which bear very little upon the subject; but as they are brought forward by doctors of the Roman Catholic Church, it may help my friend to come with more solid argument, if

I just draw the teeth of all inferences on these brought forward by the bishops of his Church, and show you that they have no foundation in them. One passage is not unfrequently referred to—Book of Revelations, i. 4: "Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne." On this passage I can shut Mr. French's mouth at once. The "seven spirits" have been considered by the Church of Rome to be angels or saints giving aid or assistance to men. Now, I do not wish to enter on the exposition of the seven spirits. Instead, I shall close his lips at once by an extract from the writings of his glorious St. Augustine; who uses the following words:—"Which Holy Spirit is chiefly commended to us in Scripture by the sevenfold number, as well in Isaiah as in the *Apocalypse*, where the seven spirits are most evidently set forth on account of the sevenfold operation of one and the same Spirit." "Hence, also, the Holy Spirit is commended to us by the number seven." — *Exposition of Psalm* cl. vol. iv. p. 1693.

Now, that completely shuts Mr. French's mouth on the interpretation of that passage; and if he dare venture to declare that these spirits are seven angels or *saints*, I will bring forward the "glorious" Augustine, and show that the father is pleased to differ *toto cælo* from his patron and pupil. I have another passage from another father. This [opening the book] is the illustrious Gregory Nazianzen, from 41 Orat. p. 733. "The precious spirits were called *seven*. For Isaiah, I think, was accustomed to call the operations of the *Spirit*, spirits." I have another extract still, confirmatory of the very same view, from

another father. St. Ambrose—Exposition of Gospel of St. Luke, tom. i. p. 1498. “Treasure up, then, as a good money changer of the Lord, the Lord’s discourses, his chaste discourses, the silver tried by the fire, and purified by THE SEPTIFORM SPIRIT.”

Now, observe, my learned antagonist must not dare bring forward that passage in favour of the worship of saints. Three fathers give the Protestant comment. The next passage is Rev. v. 5, where we have described to us the four living creatures with harps in their hands, and the four-and-twenty elders, with harps and vials full of odours, which are the *prayers of saints*; and they sang a new song, saying, “Worthy is the Lamb,” and so on. Now, in the first place, is there *one particle* in this about the Invocation of Saints? Here is a symbolic book called the Book of Revelations, or Apocalypse—here is a symbolic vision of the four-and-twenty elders, and the four living creatures—who are represented with “harps,” the *insignia* of kings, and with vials, the *insignia* of priests, and as rejoicing and singing the song, “Worthy is the Lamb,”—is there one particle of precedent here for the Invocation of Saints? Can the most acute and ingenious intellect deduct or sublimate from this glorious vision, one jot of Scripture commendatory of the duty of invoking and venerating saints? There is nothing on the question. It is simply a symbolical vision, representing the Church of the redeemed in the figurative manner; in which all these things are described in the Book of Revelations, just in the same manner as Christ is represented with “seven eyes.” Many figurative kinds of phraseology are used to denote the truths in this book; and if you admit the fact that the whole of this book is

symbolical, this representation must be symbolic also. In the last place, there is not one particle as to venerating saints in the whole passage; so that if my friend should bring forth that passage in behalf of the dogma, he will be trying his old trick of extracting moon-beams from cucumbers. [Laughter.]

Again, I quote Rev. viii. 3. I quote this passage because I know my antagonist intends to do so. We read here that the inspired penman saw an angel with a golden censer, and in that censer presenting the prayers of all saints. The Church of Rome maintains that this angel is one of the angels that are about the throne. If so, he must have been possessed of the great attribute of omniscience, to know the prayers of *all*; he must further be possessed of omnipotence, to be able to present them *all*; he must, in short, (even from the admission of the Church of Rome) excel, in his resources and capabilities, all the angels and archangels that are in heaven; nay, he must even rise to the lofty level of the godhead, before, in one golden censer, he shall be able to present *all* the prayers of *all* the saints that have lived from the time of the apostasy of Adam to the present hour. But, my friends, when we refer to the word of God for an exposition of what is meant by the angel, I read of “the *angel of the covenant*.” I read of “the angel Jehovah,” or as it is literally translated, the Jehovah angel—the words in Hebrew being literally “Jehovah sent, or the messenger.” I read of that angel who is called “the Lord of Hosts;” who is the mighty God, the High-priest, who went out once a-year, and took a golden censer, in which he presented all the prayers of the children of Israel; and therefore, at once I see, from reading the expositions and parallel refer-

ence of the sacred volume from the Jewish types and solemnities, that this angel with "the golden censer was the Lord Jesus Christ, who has entered once into the holy place," and who, in "the golden censer" of his glorious atonement, perfumed by the intercession and efficacy of his mediation, presents the prayers of all who come to God through him. "The golden censer" formed part of the furniture of the Holy of Holies, which *none* but the High-priest could enter or interfere with.

My learned antagonist admits that Christ has the high and the exclusive prerogative of being the great High-priest, and therefore that the golden censer is his property, and that the presentation of all the prayers of saints in that golden censer is his high and his inalienable prerogative. Several other passages have been quoted by the Church of Rome from the Apocalypse, totally irrelevant to the question. You may rest assured that the Church of Rome was very hard driven when she had recourse to these and similar texts, because, really, if any impartial reader refers to the passage, there is not one particle about the worship of saints, not one atom or *iota* as to invoking, venerating, or honouring saints, or anything to lead you to suppose that the INVOCATION OF SAINTS is of a scriptural and an apostolical usage.

I have stated that the practice is unprofitable, and next that it is unscriptural. I have to reply, in the third place, that the practice of invoking saints appears to me to be the most useless and most unnecessary process that a poor deluded sinner can possibly have recourse to. Every blessing has heretofore been obtained without it. I find in the sacred Scriptures, that there never was a saint in the history of

the Church, in troubles so deep, and in dangers and adversities so overwhelming, that from the depth of his danger and his sorrow his prayer did not rise to God, and, through Christ alone, bring down an answer in mercy and in peace. When Daniel, even in the lion's den, lifted up his prayer to the most high God, that prayer pierced through the ponderous stone of the dreary sepulchre, and rose "as on eagles' wings," and reached the ear of his Father and his God; and Daniel was mercifully delivered, while the monarch who imprisoned him was eventually overthrown. The prayers of Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego rose from the burning and the fiery furnace, and "one like the Son of man" heard them. From the glens and gray moors of my native land, where martyrs bled to seal their faithfulness to Christ, and their protest against the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, and from our desert hills and dreary moss-hags, the prayer of many saints arose like incense at morn and at eventide. He that watched over them listened to their cry, and delivered them from the cells of the Inquisition, and from the *auto da fés* of Spain, from the dungeons that imprisoned the martyrs, and from the flames that consumed them. Prayer has ever reached God, through Christ, without the intervention of saints, and brought down answers of mercy and comfort. The prayer of Solomon, through Christ, for wisdom, was instantly answered. The prayer to God of the holy Elisha, for a double portion of that spirit which inspired Elijah, was instantly heard and answered. The prayer of Moses, as he wrestled in spirit upon the mountain-top, prevailed immediately with God, and the armies of Joshua were victorious as they fought with their foes in the

valley below. These instances of sacred writ are proof, in addition to many I can adduce from the long catalogue of those saints who are recorded by the pen of truth, to confirm me in this most consolatory position, that if a sinner stood but one inch on this side hell, and even at its very lintels prayed to God, in the name of Jesus, for mercy and acceptance, all the devils in hell could not keep down that prayer, or prevent its rising and receiving a return. In the 107th Psalm I find many most beautiful instances of prayers addressed to God, through Jesus, being directly replied to. 107th Psalm, and 13th verse:—"Then they cried to the Lord in their trouble, and he saved them out of their distresses."

[The reverend gentleman was here interrupted by some whispering, which he explained as follows:—"I am reminded that in the *Douay* version it is the 106th Psalm; in *our* version it is the 107th."]

Again, I read the twelfth verse of the same psalm (cvii.):—"Therefore he brought down their heart with labour; they fell down and there was none to help them. Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he *saved* them out of their distresses." At the eighteenth verse, "Their soul abhorreth all manner of meat, and they draw near unto the gates of death. Then they cry unto the Lord in their troubles, and he *saveth* them out of their distresses." Twenty-sixth verse:—"They mount up to heaven, they go down again to the depths, their soul is melted because of trouble. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and he bringeth them out of their distresses."

Indeed I might go on and quote psalm on psalm, in which the distressed and the perplexed are represented as calling unto God alone,

and God is represented as immediately delivering them. I refer, in the next place, to the great Apostle of the faith, the Lord Christ Jesus; and if my learned antagonist will show one solitary instance in which Christ rejected the prayer of the sinner, and told him to go to some saint to help him, I will give up the controversy. When the blind came to Christ he opened their long-closed eyes; when the deaf came to him, he unstopped their ears; when the halt came to him, at his touch they leapt and danced like the roe; he stood by the silent and mouldering dead, and said, "Come forth!" and Lazarus burst open the bars of death, and looked forth from the cerements of the tomb, at the animating mandate of his Lord; the repentant thief upon the cross, in dying accents, prayed to the Redeemer, and received at once a glorious assurance; Mary Magdalene, whose bosom had been the abode of seven demons, came to Christ, and he immediately forgave and sanctified her; and, lastly, I find his most comprehensive and attractive declaration is—*Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.* I call on you all, my Roman Catholic friends, to ponder deeply on that sacred sentiment—*Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.* You may, my dear friends, be cast out if you go to *angels*, for neither angels or saints have one thousandth part of the mercy of Christ; but if you go to Christ at once, you find it to be true—"him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." The complaint which again and again reverberated through the streets of Jerusalem, and which was accompanied by the tears of the Redeemer, was—*Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life.* So that if we look, my friends, at the various instances recorded in

sacred Scripture, if we look at the instances of our Lord's reception and treatment of those who came to him, we shall not find one particle of warrant or necessity for the practice of invoking saints, or for paying them any religious service. I find, indeed, an express prohibition of it in the Epistle to the Coloss. ii. 18 :—"Let no man beguile you"—this is addressed most impressively and emphatically to Roman Catholics—"Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and *worshipping of angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." I read it recorded of angels again—"Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation?" but not one word as to our paying any religious service to them whatever.

My next position (which I have barely time to enter upon) is, that this saint-worship, or *Doulia*, is not only unscriptural, unprofitable, and unnecessary, but that it has actually degenerated into the grossest and most fanatical superstition that can possibly be imagined. I call your attention to the fact of Don Carlos having appointed the Virgin Mary *Generalissimo* (!) of his army, and placed it under her special protection. [Laughter.] It is also known, that various saints have been assigned to various places, and these places are regarded as specially safe, and invested with special immunity from the vengeance of heaven, and the judgments of earth, through their intercession. I may mention, too, that at the tomb of Becket (you read this in every English history) at Canterbury, there was a shrine for Becket, another for Mary, and another for Christ; and 100%!! were found cast into Becket's begging box, 10%!! into the Virgin's,

and—0!! into Christ's!—a very impressive estimate of the practical consequences of this doctrine! I hold also in my hand [holding up the book] a valuable book, exceedingly scarce, called the Life of St. Francis, which is illustrated with pictures. In the first place, it is not a book entirely destitute of authority. It was published in an age when there was a strict censorship of books, when all writings were studiously prohibited that were judged unsound or unprofitable for the faithful. It is prefaced by testimonies of popes and archbishops. This book has the approbation of P. Hermanus Lisens, minister provincial, who declares that "this book is printed with type, illustrated with many pictures, and is useful for exciting the devotion of the faithful." It is also signed by his reverence the Archdeacon of Mechlin. Now, I quote three passages from this work. The first picture, you observe [the reverend gentleman here exhibited the picture, explaining it by various motions of the hands], represents Christ, seated on an elevated spot, holding three darts in his hand, with which he is about to destroy the world in indignation, and Mary is represented as sitting at his feet, and praying that he would not destroy the world; and it is added, that in consequence of *Mary's*! intercession, the Son of God does not destroy the world, when he had otherwise intended it!! This is one practical fruit of this doctrine of the Invocation of Saints. Oh! what an insult to the blessed Redeemer, who poured out his blood like water, who was buffeted, and reviled, and spit upon; who came from a height of glory to which an archangel's wing never rose, and descended to a depth of misery which human plumb-line never fathomed, in order that he might

save and sympathize with a guilty world; and yet Mary is represented as more powerful, more sympathizing, more merciful than Christ! [Strong sensation, during which the respective chairmen arose to order.] I will show you another picture, out of the same book, which is "illustrated with many pictures," "for the use of the faithful." Observe [displaying the wood-cut to the audience], here is a picture of St. Francis himself, represented as entertaining most familiarly many birds, beasts, and fishes, who come after him. [Laughter.] I quote this as a proof of the legendary absurdities which this doctrine has given rise to—nay, which Rome has sanctioned, and to which she has given her solemn seal and *imprimatur*, and recommended as useful in the devotions of the faithful. St. Francis is here represented as standing amid elephants, oxen, cats, dogs, and fishes, and preaching to them [loud laughter], until a grasshopper begins chirping, sings a song, perches himself upon his finger, remains there as long as he wishes, hops off, comes again, and sings and carols most cheerily to the saint. [Renewed laughter.] The next picture represents St. Francis in heaven, pulling souls out of purgatory. [Holding up the picture amid much laughter.] Here is St. Francis at the top of the picture, dragging the poor creatures out of the midst of purgatory, which is set forth by flames, depicted in spite of that most glorious rescript—"The blood of Christ Jesus cleanses from all sin." I fear my time forbids me to quote more of this to-night. I have extracts from the Breviary, and extracts respecting other saints, to bring forward by-and-by, illustrative of the gross and grovelling results to which this practice of the Invocation of Saints has led. I say the

result of such a system has been to debase men's minds, and to withdraw them from all just notions of God; especially from following in the footsteps of their Lord and Saviour, and imitating his example in suffering, in sorrow, and in death; and of riveting their affections, their hopes, and their intensest prospects upon guilty creatures, on fabulous saints, and to their expecting mercy and salvation from them. How thoroughly, my friends, is all this doctrine met and overcome, when we read we have "a great High-priest; and that he ever liveth to make intercession for us!" To show you the completeness of such a representation, remember the fact which I have urged continually on your attention, namely, that the high-priest went of old into the temple once a-year, bearing on his breastplate all the names of the tribes of the children of Israel; and when he went into the holy place with these names engraven on his breastplate, he poured forth his intercession, and offered sacrifice and incense to the Lord, and pleaded and interceded for them that they might be saved.

Now the antitype of that High-priest (even by the admission of our opponents) is the LORD JESUS CHRIST, the great High-priest of our profession. He, my Roman Catholic friends, has gone into the Holy of Holies, bearing the names of the myriads of the vast human family engraven on his heart, and inscribed on the palms of his hands. He has taken your case, your sympathies, your sorrows, your sins, and your wants into the presence of his Father, and the endearing language recorded of him is—"Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold I have graven thee

upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me." "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be renewed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee." And, moreover, he expressly asserts (Heb. vii. 25), he is "able to save, to the uttermost, *all that come to God through him.*" He does not say, "all that come unto God through *St. Peter*, or through *St. Francis*, or through saints or angels of any kind," but he is able to save, to the uttermost, all that come unto God **THROUGH HIM, at once through him**, seeing "he ever liveth to make intercession for them." I had intended to enter on some further illustrations of the gross superstitious results to which this tenet in the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth has necessarily led; but as I have scarcely a minute more, I can only call your attention to the real definition of the doctrine which is to be discussed. Remember, the question is not *whether one saint may ask the prayers of another on earth*, nor is it *whether a saint in heaven may pray for saints on earth*; but the question is directly narrowed to the limits within which the Church of Rome has placed it:—**WHETHER WE, ON EARTH, MAY PRAY TO SAINTS IN HEAVEN?** I have no doubt my opponent will be perfectly prepared to demonstrate how it is, that *St. Francis*, or *St. Peter*, or any other *finite* saint in heaven, can hear a prayer offered up at Edinburgh, another prayer offered up in London—a prayer offered up in Paris—a prayer offered at Kamschatka, and a prayer offered up in the frozen regions of the north—it remains, in short, for my antagonist to show how the saints can be *finite*, and yet have attri-

butes that proclaim them to be—*infinite!*

[The reverend gentleman's hour here terminated, after which some little confusion ensued.]

MR. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen—It is a very old and a very trite observation—Every man has his peculiar talent. My friend, my reverend friend, was evidently born with a singular aptitude for oratory. I was born, if I may be allowed to analyze my own little talents, with an equally decided aptitude for logic. I have listened very attentively this evening for something like close reasoning on the part of my learned friend, for that is what I am foud of; and I can find, actually, no deductions of any kind but what are drawn as usual from "oriental" premises. The learned gentleman has told you, and has repeated it over and over again since we commenced this discussion, that the fathers of the Church are all at variance with each other, or, to use his own elegantly illustrative expression, "knocking their heads continually against one another." [Laughter, and cries of "Order."] My answer to that is (and I will prove it this evening), that upon the doctrine of the **INVOCATION OF ANGELS and SAINTS**, as well as on all other fundamental tenets of our **FAITH**, they are to our adversaries most gallingly harmonious and concordant. And, my friends, if they are found at any time "knocking their heads" against anything, it is with one combined, well-compacted, well-directed battering-ram, "knocking" them against the fortresses and bulwarks of Protestantism. Yes, I will prove to my friend, gentlemen, this evening, as upon former occasions, that upon fundamental points and vitals of Christianity, there is the most perfect

agreement between them. But there is a great degree of latitude and of liberty allowed to CATHOLIC divines, as well as to CATHOLIC laymen, in interpreting those passages of the Bible, concerning which no man can pretend to speak oracularly except my learned antagonist, whom you have just this moment heard, and whose infallibility, when he rises with the Bible in his hand, is so unquestionable. [Laughter]. You have had a specimen of this his oracular self-importance in his interpretation of "the golden censer," of which he gave you so lucid an explanation, condescending even to bring in St. Augustine in corroboration of his own intuitive wisdom. For once, therefore, "the execrable, the abominable" St. Augustine (as he was called by my learned friend, in my presenee, on a former occasion), for once St. Augustine furnishes him with an argument. Now, I take (I would answer)—I take the liberty of differing in my interpretation of the passage in question from St. Augustine, even backed as he is by my reverend opponent; for I have that liberty (however my learned friend may smile when I assert it) with regard to everything figurative, of which the meaning is not obviously determined by the laws of common sense. Every man, I maintain, may interpret such a passage as he likes, provided it does not run counter to the established articles of our FAITH. There are many passages where St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine interpret variously, and we candidly acknowledge it—and that is the grand discovery my learned friend has made, and which he boisterously calls their "knocking their heads one against the other"—but I will prove to him that, on the INVOCATION of ANGELS and SAINTS, as I have before proved

on TRANSUBSTANTIATION, and the SACRIFICE of the MASS, they are all most harmonious and concurrent. The learned gentleman has indulged himself in a little good-natured raillery, which certainly I have no time to answer; and if I had, I could not answer it with that enviable kind of smartness which is so conspicuous in all the repartees of my very grave-faced, laughter-loving, reverend antagonist. Still, however, when he alludes to my "long practice at the bar"—which is evidently "oriental" [laughter]—in point of allusion, I can only say, I wish my reverend logician could prove that I have had any experience at the British bar entitled to be called "long practice," as easily, as convincingly, as satisfactorily as I will prove to you, gentlemen, this evening, that the practice of the INVOCATION of ANGELS and SAINTS is of long standing in the CHURCH of GOD.

The learned gentleman differs from the fathers, and I also differ with him, concerning the view taken of three essential words, namely, *veneror*, *δουλεῖω*, and *adoro*. He has been taking down the lexicographers of ancient times, in order to dive into the peculiar meaning of the words. I have not had recourse to the same labours—I have that knowledge, thank God, in my memory (the gracious gift of heaven), without the necessity of pulling down immense folios to refer to. That the word *veneror* in Latin is frequently used in the elegant, classical sense to which he has affixed these words, I do not deny; but as it is possible for a man to say in good Latin *veneror Deum*, I adore God, so it is good Latin to say, *veneror istum senem cujus capilla*—as my reverend, benevolent friend characterized me in one of the playful, wanton sallies of his wit, in which he alluded to a few gray hairs

on my head—mere stragglers, by-the-bye [laughter]—*veneror istum senem cujus capille sunt respersæ senectutis canitie*, I venerate that old man whose locks are sprinkled with the hoariness of old age. There *veneror* would mean to *venerate*, not to adore with religious worship.

Again, in illustration of this, I would say *Δουλεύω*, in the Greek, comes from *Δουλος*, a *slave*, and, taken figuratively, we say *Δουλεύω τοις γραμμασι*, I am a slave—that is, I am passionately addicted—to literature. My reverend friend has said, alluding to some constantly-revolving phrase, “*I find this nineteen times in the Bible.*” Well, he is most indubitably a very accurate counter; and I also am going to tell the learned gentleman, this evening, before I sit down, what I find in that book, and I think that my finding will be quite as good as any discovery which he has been enabled to make, in the spirituality of *his* investigation, ay, and *nineteen times* better and more appropriate.

The learned gentleman next has told you that I complained most bitterly of his having the last word. I did complain, but I did not complain with any tears in my eyes, nor with any symptoms of anguish in my countenance. [Laughter]. I complained that he was about to use the last hour in giving me the bitter ashes of declamation and of ranting, instead of the solid food of sound, logical argument. And, my friends, you must own we have had a little specimen of it this evening. The learned gentleman having a large field of argument before him, to which Protestants who are seriously bent upon the elucidation of the truth generally turn, at least the members of the Church of England—having, I say, such an extended space of argument before him, if the learned gentleman would confine

himself to that solely, and not fly into the different extravagances and vagaries said by one man and committed to writing by another, he would show a much more honourable, straightforward way of acting; indeed, he would please his CATHOLIC audience much more, and indispose the *unroving* part of his Protestant audience much less.

My reverend *politics-disclaiming* argumentator next observes, that Don Carlos appointed the BLESSED VIRGIN generalissimo of his army. Well, I say, that is most apparently an oriental expression; of which, had the learned gentleman only chosen to have exerted his “oriental” capacity, he would have told you the meaning in a moment. Why, the sole meaning is, my friends, since the reverend theologian will not condescend to explain, that he, Don Carlos, put himself and his army under the protection of the BLESSED VIRGIN, that she might intercede for him with the Lord of Hosts. But I do acknowledge, at the same time, that in our sober, unoriental English it would be a very inappropriate mode of expression; but the learned gentleman must know, that what is perfectly admissible according to the genius of one language, is totally inadmissible according to the genius of another; and yet even here I cannot altogether acquit my learned friend of an endeavour to wound the feelings of Catholics, instead of arguing fairly, when he descends to such observations. But, my friends, the real burden imposed upon me by my learned and reverend friend this evening (as it appears to me) is to prove most satisfactorily to this audience, that the doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, laid down by our divines and practised from age to age in the CATHOLIC CHURCH, is neither *unprimitive*,

nor *unscriptural*. This, gentlemen, is a burden very easy for me to sustain, and I shall not in the least stagger under the weight of it, whatever may be the anticipation of my learned friend. But, my friends, I shall proceed logically, not oratorically, to prove that it is not *unprimitive*—notwithstanding my learned friend's vehement outbreaks against appealing to the fathers. To prove, I say, that it is not *unprimitive*, the plain and obvious way that suggests itself to me, seems to be to open the pages of *history*; and, to prove that it is not *unscriptural*, the equally plain and obvious way is to open the pages of *Scripture*. The learned gentleman—if he could control me, if he could play the tyrant, as he is wishing to do secretly now, would say, Away with the fathers, throw them to the bats and to the moles, and come to Scripture! I answer him like a bold Briton, *I will not*. You shall not control me; *I will* chalk out my own line of walking, and will not be obstructed by any undue, imperious interference. This is the mode, gentlemen, which I shall adopt to confute my learned adversary in his attempt to impress on your minds that the doctrine of the *Invocation of Angels* and of *Saints*, as well as other fundamental tenets of our HOLY CATHOLIC RELIGION, are nothing more than so many pious frauds and specious delusions—[Interruption]. (Really there is such a noise it is impossible to proceed.) [The Chairmen having restored order, the learned gentleman continued]—are so many pious frauds and delusions imposed upon the belief of Christians in some dark, ignorant and unlettered age. This task which I have chalked out to myself requires, my friends, some little erudition; but the way I shall take to display this little erudition, which

I may have been able to amass by laborious study, is quite the reverse to that which is generally adopted—(Really there is such a noise that I cannot go on. Is it done on purpose?)

[On the restoration of order, the learned gentleman proceeded.]

I shall pursue a course quite the reverse of that which is generally adopted by my learned friend in his argumentation, which is that of perplexing and darkening every thing which it is the province of learning to simplify and elucidate. He tells me that "I am going (I have noted down his words) to take a *deep* plunge into the FATHERS," and he uttered the expression, gentlemen, with a visible kind of tremour all over his body. [Laughter, and cries of "Order."] Really, gentlemen, my ingenious and talented friend, my hyperbolically oratorical friend, seems to be labouring under a very serious spiritual disease. You have all heard of that malady, that hard word called *Hydrophobia*,—I am rather inclined to designate my friend's disease as one of a much more alarming nature, namely, that spiritual malady which I would call *Patrophobia* [laughter]—that is, a cold, shuddering, inherent dread of touching the pages of the FATHERS; an affection of the soul, which I am afraid is perfectly irremediable, or, in plain English, incurable. However, gentlemen, I have no doubt—at least I give him the credit of it—that he is perfectly satiated with these fathers; but, whatever may be his nausea as to that water of benediction which flows so beautifully through the pages of the fathers, savouring as it does, in its every drop, of the pages of the Bible, I must inform him that I have not as yet had *my* full glut of it. They, the fathers, who are such a bugbear to my learned, spiritually-

diseased friend, form a very lucid and a very brilliant point in the map and panorama of every annal and event which ecclesiastical history spreads before the eye of the spectator. Their pages *must be opened*, if we wish to know what was "the antiquity of ancient days;" and, when we shall have referred to them, it shall be my business to show how they coincide with the pages of the Bible. And mark, my friends, I wish to deal candidly and equitably with my antagonist—a dealing which I have never yet experienced from his courtesy. If I were to defer the fathers till the end, as I have the last speaking this evening, and I have the opportunity of giving him "a good scourging," to use his own expression, [laughter]—if I wish to act unfairly I should reserve the FATHERS to the last. But no, I will marshal them forward in the very van of the dispute, and then I will appeal solely to the BIBLE. My friend cannot complain of my making that appeal, inasmuch as he knows all the Bible by heart, and can take any ingenious advantage over me in that way. There is a maxim, my friends, of the great St. Augustine, who flourished in the year 391, a father whom Calvin called, though so much disesteemed by the Calvinists of the present day, *fidelissimus testis antiquitatis* (for I must hammer that into the mind of my learned friend by mere dint of thundering repetition)—"the most faithful witness of all antiquity"—it is an observation of the great St. Augustine, which may be very appropriately called to mind on the present occasion, that "*what the Church has observed in all times and in all places, is of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.*" I really must repeat it once again—"That what the Church has observed in all times

and in all places is of Apostolical Tradition."

Now, my friends, amid these observances, flourishing "in all times and in all places," I shall clearly prove to you this evening, not after the manner of my "oriental" friend, by supposition, and presumption, and arbitrary deduction, but by a series of close and solid argument, that the practice, of Invoking Angels and Saints is one of the most conspicuous. As to the antiquity of the practice, it is, gentlemen, susceptible of very easy proof. So far from the doctrine being new or unheard of, or the offspring of one of those convenient dark ages, that very convenient, unfathomable, inexorable depth into which it is the custom of Protestants to plunge every event headlong (the date of which, it is said, cannot be ascertained, if it seems to make against the antiquity of their doctrine)—so far, I say, so far from being the offspring of one of those dark ages, as the learned divines of the Church of England and Scotland most unlearnedly contend, we find, on the contrary, on opening the page of ecclesiastical historians, that the man who first had the daring to raise his voice against it, namely, in the year 376, struck the whole Church of God with horror and astonishment. Who that is really versed in ecclesiastical history—(and I will give my friend credit for being well versed in it—too well versed in it, indeed, to be willing to pour forth his treasures to this assembly upon it)—who, I say, that is really well versed in ecclesiastical history, has not heard of the name Vigilantius, that impious innovator, who, at that early period, namely, in the year 376, first called the doctrine of the INVOCATION of ANGELS and SAINTS in question? Who, on the other hand, has not heard of the

illustrious ST. JEROME, of whom it has been the fashion among all the learned divines of the Church of England to speak with sentiments of the deepest reverence? Who, I repeat, has not heard of St. Jerome, who has handed down to all posterity, in his beautiful writings, the sense which THE CHURCH entertained on that subject? The CHURCH of God, you will there find, arose with one voice in every part of the world, against the shameless effrontery of Vigilantius, the counterpart of my learned friend, who had the audacity to stigmatize the doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints as a base depravation of Christianity. The words of the illustrious St. Jerome are—"If," says St. Jerome (in refutation of his slander upon the Church), "*the apostles and martyrs, whilst still in their bodies on earth, could pray for others at a time when they ought to have been solicitous concerning their own welfare, how much more natural is it that they should do so now, after the obtainment of their crowns, their victories, and triumphs! Paul, the apostle, tells us, that two hundred three score and sixteen souls in the ship with him were saved by his prayers; and am I to believe, that the moment he was dissolved and began to be with Christ, that then his voice was hushed for ever? that he had no longer the power even to breathe a prayer for those who had been evangelized by his preaching? In one word, am I to believe that the dog Vigilantius living is of more power and energy than that lion, the mighty Paul, dead?*"—St. Jerome's Epistle.

And here let me ask of any candid, impartial hearer, who is neither prepossessed nor prejudiced against our doctrine by the wild declamation of my learned friend, however elegant and overflowing with meta-

phorical it may be (for I give him credit for knowing how, in a most practised manner, to feed the minds of his audience with tropes and figures in substitution for argument), let me ask, I say, of any calm, unbiassed auditor, who is not captivated by mere sound, if Vigilantius, who, according to all history, was in the whole tenor of his life a stain and foul blot upon the features of Christianity, is to be listened to, when he calls the glorious doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints superstitious, in preference to the illustrious Jerome, who declared, at the same period, that it had been uninterruptedly transmitted from the apostles? Is there any one acquainted with ecclesiastical history that would prefer the testimony of Vigilantius to that of St. Jerome? Is there any one who, judging profoundly on these matters, would put on one side of the scale Vigilantius and all the heretics who have since lived, with my orthodox friend on the right [Rev. Mr. C.] thrown over all as a make-weight [Laughter]—is there any one, I ask, who would dare to say that all combined would preponderate, when "the dead lion" the illustrious St. Jerome, is thrown in on the other? But although at this epoch, at which St. Jerome tells us that the Invocation of Angels and Saints was the established usage over the whole Christian world; although this was the practice established in that age, still, my friends, the CATHOLIC takes not his stand solely at the threshold of the fourth century in order to prove the primitiveness and the antiquity of the practice, not daring to uplift his eyes to any preceding century, and thus to trace it by regular gradation to the very days of the apostles. Shall we, my friends, dread to inspect the pages of yet earlier fathers, lest we should

discover in them any direct disavowal of our doctrines, or a total silence concerning them? No, my friends, it is a field into which I willingly invite my learned gladiator against CATHOLICITY to follow me (for that is a word which has been suggested to me in a little conversation I had with him before entering this room, and he knows I used it good-naturedly.) We have already consulted the illustrious St.

Jerome, in the year 376. Now let us mount a little higher, and mount gradually at the same time. I go to the year 351, to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote in Greek; St. Jerome wrote in Latin, and this is only a quarter of a century before St. Jerome. Let us see what he says concerning the doctrine:—*“Now when the spiritual sacrifice is completed, and this unbloody worship over, the victim of propitiation, we supplicate God for the common peace of the churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted, and in a word, we pray and offer this sacrifice for all who stand in need of assistance. We next commemorate those who are gone before us—the patriarchs, apostles, prophets, and martyrs—begging that, through their prayers and intervention, God would receive our supplication. We then pray for the holy fathers and bishops that are dead, and for all the faithful departed, believing that their souls receive very great relief from the prayers that are offered for them while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar.”*

—*Catech. Mystag.* v. n. 3. 9. pp. 327, 328. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1720.

Now, mark, my friends, whilst St. Cyril of Jerusalem thus catechizes the faithful in the year 351, we hear not one syllable as to the doctrine being oppugned in any part of the world. No Vigilantius was then

alive. We hear not a murmur against it as being unprimitive or unapostolical. Where, I may ask, where were all the Calvinists of those early days? In what vale, on what mountain, was the sun smiling upon those pure *lilies of Sharon*? [Laughter.] Surely they could have no mutual fellowship and society with men so totally *unscotch-like* in their rituals as St. Jerome and St. Cyril?

But, gentlemen, let us ascend a little higher, to times yet more remote, and not forget to cite the testimony of another illustrious compeer of St. Cyril, namely, the GREAT ST. HILARY; he lived in the year 315. St. Hilary says,—*“To those who wish to stand firmly, there is not wanting the custody of the saints nor the guardianship of the angels. We recollect that there are many spiritual powers that are called angels, who preside over churches; and as the Lord teaches, ‘the angels of the little ones always see God.’ It is not the character of the Deity that stands in need of this intercession, but it is our infirmity that requires it.”*—St. Hil. Comm. in Psalm cxxiv. 1 Ed. Bened. Paris, 1693.

And mark, my friends, though I am now citing the testimonies of father upon father, yet when those fathers cite Scripture in corroboration of their doctrine *I do not omit that Scripture*; although my learned and reverend friend will, as usual, when he arises, with all gravity imaginable affirm, that total silence as to Scripture is, as usual, my grand defect. Yes, my friends, and such is the gaping nature of the intellects of some part of this audience, that such exclamation on the part of my reverend antagonist will immediately pass with them for demonstrative reason and testimony against the whole tenor of my

argument. So incurable is the disease of wildly-growing, deeply-rooted fanaticism in the plains of Hammersmith! But to return to my subject. These are the words of the Great St. Hilary, for he is called THE GREAT by all the divines now living at Oxford and Cambridge, when they write against the Unitarians, an occasion on which it is natural they should magnify his name: the *Great* St. Hilary, so celebrated for his immortal combats against the Arians, those deniers of the divinity of Christ. I ask, therefore, gentlemen, shall we, when we look at the authority of those saints, so justly renowned in the annals of the Christian world, shall we be affected by the extemporaneous declamation of my learned friend, who has at command, on every subject which he thinks proper to degrade and vilify, a copious loquacity not to be paralleled, perhaps, even by any *improvisatore* of the nineteenth century?

No, gentlemen, begging his pardon, I will retain my love for venerable antiquity, and when I want to know what was primitive belief, I will not go to Glasgow, to Edinburgh, or to any of those northern regions, but I will take, with his permission, what he calls "a plunge," a deep, decisive plunge into those pure wells of water, flowing from the Bible and from tradition conjointly into the writings of the illustrious fathers of the Church. [Laughter.] Again, I say, let my rev. friend deny—for I see he is determined to say we are persisting in an erroneous, an idolatrous worship—can my reverend opponent deny that the imposture, if it be one, is at least extremely old? If my friend call it an imposture, I ask, ought he not, the next time he mounts his Calvinistic pulpit, ought he not to inform his

congregation, ought he not to have the candour to inform them, that the CATHOLIC, in advocating the Invocation of Angels and Saints, has at least great antiquity to sanction his belief? While he calls them superstitious, benighted, and idolatrous, ought he not to say, in the same breath, if at the end of his long-winded invective against our idolatry he can breathe at all [Laughter]; ought he not, I say, to observe—But I am bound in candour and in conscience, *my Calvinistic primitives*, to acquaint you that the benighted Papists can substantiate their arguments in favour of such Invocation of Angels and Saints by many a long roll of time-worn, musty records of most indubitable authenticity?

That is the way, I think, in which he ought to address his audience next Sunday when he mounts his pulpit. But now let us ascend again with some rapidity, and reach the age in which ST. CYPRIAN flourished—St. Cyprian, who threw such lustre over the Church of God in the year 248. We have, therefore, got very comfortably up to the year 248, near Christ:—"Let us be merciful," says St. Cyprian, "*of one another in our prayers; with one mind and with one heart, in this world, and in the next; let us always pray with mutual charity, relieving our sufferings and afflictions; and may the charity of him who, by divine favour, shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord; may his prayers for his brethren and sisters not cease.*"—*De Habitu Virg.* p. 181. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1726.

Now let us pause awhile, my Christian friends, and consider *when* was this written; not, as in the cool and placid moment which we are enjoying in this room, where my learned friend may dogmatize at his

pleasure, with the new lights of this 19th century, and laugh all-leisurely at me, who am come with my learning from the musty records of antiquity; but he, Cyprian, writes this at a time when hundreds and thousands, all over the Roman empire, were immured in the damp and the deadly precincts of dungeons and dark pestilential mines, expecting daily and nightly to be dragged forth to be broken on the rack, or scathed and devoured either by the wild beasts or by the flame, and thus have the honour of dying as martyrs to the faith, in the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ. St. Cyprian himself—that great, inexpressibly great saint, to any one who has an eye for genuine sanctity, and who will condescend to read his celestially eloquent productions—I say St. Cyprian was himself, at the time that he wrote this, panting for the immortal palm of martyrdom, which he eventually obtained; and his name has been uniformly held in veneration, and his intercession uninterruptedly been prayed for, until those two dismal, gloomy, and unhallowed ravagers of all the glorious fields of antiquity arose in the sixteenth century, to plant their anti-christian standards, Luther and Calvin! Let me hope, therefore, at all events, that when my reverend opponent arises, he will disclaim that wild notion, that this doctrine of ours was the invention of some dark modern age. For if he does not, he must go as far as he can do to expunge that glorious saint from the record, where his name so transcendantly shines among the uncontested martyrs of the Church. But, my friends, I ask, Shall the GREAT ST. CYPRIAN be silenced by these rude, these unhallowing trampers upon everything antiquity held sacred, these divines, as they call themselves forsooth, of

the nineteenth century? or shall they themselves, the reverend divines of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, stand convicted by the testimony of St. Cyprian, of calumniating the Catholic, who, in this said century, inculcates precisely the same doctrine which that illustrious saint received from apostolic tradition, in the year of our Lord 248? No, I am persuaded that every sincere Protestant investigator of truth (and there are many such in this room at present) will entertain a more exalted notion of St. Cyprian than of all these modern columns of orthodoxy, towering with their proud heads together, without any other foundation to stand upon than that of gratuitous assumption in impressing the tenets of their creed. With what face, with what congruity, let me ask, will the Church of England or the Scotch divine henceforth urge the testimony of this anti-Nicene father, the great St. Cyprian, against the Unitarian, in order to prove the divinity of Christ, if they will not admit the testimony of the same father to be of the least validity in proving the Invocation of the Angels and Saints? Alas for the cause of my reverend antagonist! though propped up and assisted as it is by the various sectarians that are this day thickening around him, and smiling encouragement in his face, whilst I am filling it with perplexity and terror! No, my friends, it is not in the power of all the sects around him, be they Anabaptists, Methodists, or Irvingites, to extricate him this day from his strange embarrassment. I say this, gentlemen, because my reverend antagonist, you may remember, upbraided me, in one of his addresses to you, with courting the smiles of Anabaptists and others, in order, if possible, to band them

in my cause 'against his Calvinistic Church. What! I court the smiles, or be ambitious of the applause, of those who are alien to my Church? What! I, seated on the imperishable, the impregnable rock of ages, seek for joy or consolation from the applauding eye of any of these new-sprung mushrooms around me? No, my friends, I come with divine and unquestionable records, and I defy you to invalidate the stamp of their authenticity. [Sensation.] I do not mean to speak disrespectfully of any one, but I only mean that, when compared to the grey hairs which adorn and dignify the forehead of Catholic antiquity, there is a contemptible juvenility about your various churches that makes me deeply blush at their aspiring and ambitious turrets. As to the Baptists, I will say this in their favour—that, if tradition is to be discarded, and the Bible alone is to be the rule of faith, they are, in their practice, as to the rite of baptism, entitled to the profound respect of every reflecting Christian in the universe. You see, therefore, gentlemen, that St. Cyprian received from apostolic tradition, in the year 248, the doctrine of the INVOCATION of ANGELS and SAINTS.

I know not how solicitous the learned gentleman may be to enter into the field with the Unitarians, but it appears to me, from what I have been able to collect from some few transient remarks, that he is totally unsolicitous as to administering to them the least enlightenment on that subject. Come we now, my friends, to a father who flourished at a still earlier period, and let us see whether the nearer we approach to the times of the apostles the more my learned opponent will have cause to indulge in a smile of satisfaction and of triumph.

ORIGEN, who lived in the year

203:—“*Who can doubt,*” says Origen, “*that our holy fathers aid us by their prayers and strengthen and excite us by the example of their actions, as also by the writings which they have left behind them? herein teaching and instructing us how to fight against the adverse powers, and in what manner these contests are to be maintained. Thus they fight for us, and advance armed before us.*”—Orig. Homil. 26, in Num. tom. ii. p. 373. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1773.

Again, “*And of all the holy men who have quitted this life, retaining their charity towards those whom they left behind, we may be allowed to say that they are anxious for their salvation, and that they assist them with their prayers, and their mediation with God.*”

Again, “*The angels are everywhere present; come, then, thou angel, receive him that is changed from his former error, from the doctrine of demons, from loud-speaking iniquity.*”—Hom. in Ezek. t. iii. p. 358.

Again, “*I will fall down upon my knees, and not presuming, on account of my crimes, to present my prayers to God, I will invoke all the saints to my assistance. O ye saints of heaven, I beseech you, with a sorrow full of sighs and tears, fall at the feet of the Lord of mercies for me, a miserable sinner.*” Addressing himself to holy Job, he says, “*Pray for us unhappy creatures, that the mercies of the terrible God may deign to protect us in all our tribulations in the midst of the snares spread by our enemy.*”—Lib. xi. περί Job.

“What a disagreeable uniformity in these anti-Protestant fathers!”—methinks I hear the reverend gentleman muttering with himself [laughter]—methinks I hear him say, “I shall treat them all, when I rise, with contemptuous defiance, waving my parliamentary Bible in

my hand." But now, my friends, if we throw the various testimonies of the hallowed nature of such a worship in these learned fathers whose extracts I have just laid before you, is it not *loud-speaking iniquity* (if I may use the phrase of the father last cited) in any divine of the Church of England or of the Church of Scotland, who is really versed in ecclesiastical antiquity, to come forward and dispute the doctrine inculcated by all the champions of Christianity in those days—I mean the Invocation of Angels and Saints? And to combat them with no other weapons, mark ye! than shallow conclusions, arbitrary, unauthorized, and presumptuous!

As to all the high-flown rhapsody of my reverend antagonist, with reference to the instantaneous, the heaven-storming efficacy of prayer, directed straight to heaven, without the intervention of saints, in the Old Testament, if that argument is to deter the Catholic from addressing himself to angels and saints, and from giving the least heed to the Apostles' Creed, where it says, "I believe in the communion of saints," it ought equally to have operated upon St. Paul to have deterred him from requesting the prayers of his brethren, and to have upbraided him with the impiety of so palpable a departure, as my learned antagonist contends it is, from the ancient faith, as that of having recourse to the intercession of another. No, my friends, depend upon it St. Paul had read, as often as the reverend gentleman has done, the sentence which he has this evening dwelt upon with such an apparent air of triumph as to its perfect applicability to the case in question, namely, *Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out*; and yet St. Paul, over and over again, says to his various friends, with profound humility and

intense fervour, "Pray for me." Now, if all mediation save that of Christ be blasphemous, St. Paul must come in for his share also in the wide-sweeping anathema of my Calvinistic thunderer against Catholic dogmas. Yes, St. Paul, applying for any mediation save that of Christ Jesus alone, is most indubitably, in the daring language of Calvinistic impiety, a blasphemer. Indeed, the strain of reasoning adopted by the learned gentleman strikes at the very root of Christianity. If it be admissible in the Calvinist thus to reason against the Catholic, the Deist will adopt the self-same strain in reasoning against us both. Prayer in the mouth of Enoch, he will say, was available without *circumcision*; what need, therefore, of the latter, in Abraham and Isaac, to make prayer more acceptable?—nay, what need of the cross? Did not Abraham's prayer storm heaven without it? In one word, the Deist would say, nature teaches me prayer and thanksgiving to God; "I will cry unto him in the day of trouble, and he will *save me out of my distresses*," without *the mediation of the Bible*.

But, my friends, I shall refrain from quoting any more of the fathers on the present occasion, as I know my friend, during the whole of these citations, has been in a perpetual state of bodily tremor and mental agitation. [Laughter.] The solution, then, of this much-agitated point is to be found in the pages of the FATHERS, in all the ancient LITURGIES of the Church—those authentic monuments of antiquity, which are acknowledged to be authentic by all the *learned* of the Church of England—acknowledged, I say, now by the whole Christian world to be authentic monuments of genuine undepraved antiquity—and yet the learned gentleman, last evening we met, had the teme-

riousness to call them in question—temerarious, I say, it was in the extreme. Yes, unwarrantably temerarious, for I must qualify my words, lest I should use one of too strong a nature. And, now I am upon this subject, I ask the learned gentleman to point out, in Cardinal Bona, and give me the passage, where Cardinal Bona said that the LITURGY of ST. JAMES was false. I maintain that he was one of their staunchest supporters, and that that illustrious cardinal wrote volumes of panegyric on the liturgies. So that to adduce the testimony of Cardinal Bona against the said liturgies is, on the part of my learned friend, one of the most unfair, unequitable, nay, most iniquitous modes of endeavouring to extinguish their broad effulgence that was ever invented by the subtlety of an ingenious enemy, having recourse to all the lawlessness of guile, where he finds himself conquered and laid prostrate, by mere strength, in the field of legitimate argument. No, Cardinal Bona, thou glorious asserter and prover of the said liturgies, this stain attempted to be cast upon thy fair, unsullied name shall not cling to thee, it shall rebound upon thy defamer! Depend upon it, according to the testimony of your own writers, these liturgies are of unquestionable authority. Your own bishops and archbishops express that they come next to the inspired writings. “After those,” they exclaim, “take the ancient liturgies of the Church!” For my part, therefore, again I contend, (for I go from the liturgies to the fathers, and the fathers to the liturgies, ever and anon, and what grieves my reverend friend most sorely is, that those said fathers ever have the Bible in their hands) I contend most strenuously, that there is among these liturgies and these

fathers the most perfect unanimity, in contradiction to my learned friend, on vital and fundamental points, which was one object I had to prove in expatiating upon them this evening. It will remain for you, therefore, to decide, my friends, in the calm exercise of your judgment, not being the slaves of sentences melodiously tuned by either party, but being wrapt up in admiration only at soundness of argument—it will remain, I say, for you to decide, whether this doctrine of invoking the angels and saints of God has been established by the testimonies which have been alleged: it is for those who are hostile to the doctrine to account for this its early appearance, to inform us how the Church could have been in error from the beginning, and to specify the period when the dark-scowling Calvinistic inveteracy against the doctrine, which ye have all witnessed on the brow as well as in the language of my learned friend, was the inveteracy of the universal Church.

If the reverend gentleman, in answering this my hard question, should wish to indulge in conjecture as to its origin, the example of some learned Unitarians may perchance assist him. “The doctrine of the Trinity,” say they, “was the off-spring of the fourth, or as it is sometimes called in disparagement, the Athanasian age.” Unfortunately, however, for my learned friend, upon this occasion, the fathers of the first centuries, whose testimonies I have cited, deprive him of such a refuge! Again, my friends, attend most particularly to this circumstance! These liturgies of the Church are universally acknowledged—even by those heretics who separated from us in the fifth century, the Nestorians and the Eutychians, whom, to the no inconsiderable annoyance of my reverend friend, I

dwelt so much upon on a former evening; they have prayers to their saints, and still persist in praying to angels and saints, as a doctrine received by tradition from the apostles to the present day. Their liturgies, which are of apostolic origin, contain the identical prayers with the Catholic liturgies to the present day. And oh! my friends, mark this ever-memorable fact which I am about to state to you, and which is (for I here defy my learned antagonist to dispute it) most incontestably true. It is this: The liturgy of Milan has actually been in use in that city, Milan, ever since the days of St. Ambrose, who flourished in the fourth century, down to the present moment; and this, mark! notwithstanding many serious efforts made by the popes to induce them to use the liturgy which is used in the Church of Rome—though there is no difference as to *dogmas*. *No*, they would never consent to give up that liturgy; but their uniform answer has been, We received it from St. Ambrose, who received it from the apostles, and we will cling to it; and at one time there was a serious kind of quarrel on the subject. But the Pope has not absolute authority; he only has the casting voice at a general council of the Church. It is a council of the Church, with a Pope at its head, that decides a dogma of faith. But to return to the liturgy in question. They never would give or relinquish their liturgy; they retain it to this day, and it is in perfect accordance with all the liturgies used in the CATHOLIC CHURCH.

It is, therefore, most indisputably evident, my friends, from these fathers of the Church which I have quoted, that to honour saints is to honour God, who is the author of their sanctity, the great bestower of their bliss. It is evident, that to

demand of them a participation in their holy prayers, in the language of these liturgies and these fathers, is to associate ourselves with "the spirits of the perfectly just, with the Church of the first-born who are in heaven." So holy a practice must ever be the solace and delight of the truly pure and holy, who, deeply reflecting on the words of that creed, believe in "the communion of saints," and that the members of the Church triumphant in heaven are accessible to the prayers of the Church militant on earth. Above all, the sons of CATHOLICITY have in every age gloried in cherishing the most tender sentiments of devotion to MARY, the blessed mother of JESUS, our adorable Redeemer. They believe that she who obtained the working of the first glorious miracle at the marriage-feast of Cana, before his day for working miracles was come, can still obtain, by her holy influence, the working of yet more miraculous conversions, and yet more glorious and stupendous graces, for the imploring sinner at the present day, as we have received from apostolical TRADITION. We do most strenuously deny that, when the Church prays for her intercession in the following manner—"Hail, MARY, full of grace; blessed art thou among women," &c. we do most strenuously deny that there is in this prayer the least semblance, the least tincture of idolatry. Every word of this, and all other prayers, however "oriental" they may appear to the cool, sober-judging mind of my learned friend, are expressive of the unspeakable glory of Him alone who hath the power to give, and of the high exaltation of her who, in his presence, has the power to obtain. Every degree of comparison between the Mother and the SON is blasphemous; none of such a nature ever enter into the thoughts of

the CATHOLIC from the first dawn of reason to his last expiring moment, which is frequently cheered and gladdened by the utterance of this heavenly orison. But, gentlemen, whilst we most unflinchingly maintain, and most firmly believe, according to sound CATHOLIC orthodox instructions, in the beatitude of the saints, as infinitely diversified in the scale of exaltation and of glory according to their respective individual merits (which merits flow from gratuitously bestowed grace), we have been taught by the uniform, unvarying tradition of successive ages, to ascribe unto the blessed mother of our God, the ever-Virgin Mary, a pre-eminence of glory amidst all the sanctities of heaven that have been exalted by her Son Jesus.

We pronounce not the name of her whom the archangel Gabriel pronounced to be "blessed among women," without feelings of deep-felt reverential awe, which all the powers of human speech are utterly inadequate to express! Yet with this reverential feeling, these inexpressibly sweet and glowing sentiments of filial affection towards her, we do most invariably maintain, in every age, that it is unlawful, sinful, nay impious and criminal, and blasphemous, to pay to her *divine homage*, or to attribute to her any power that does not directly emanate from Christ. Our uniform language is completely the opposite of my learned friend's exaggeration; and the doctrine attributed to us, that of adoring her whose sole happiness consists in the adoration of her blessed SON, is one of those envenomed arrows of malignity with which falsehood contends with truth, or, in other words, blaspheming error with sound orthodoxy. The decisions of our Church proscribe all divine honours paid to any one in heaven or earth, save and except

to God, the glorious and undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Our catechisms in every country, and in every language, express the same doctrine; all tenets contrary to this, originate in defamation; they are the scandals engendered by impiety; they are the suggestions of the devil, seeking to combat against that CHURCH, which has it in its destinies not to be shattered by all the gates of hell [sensation]; which has in its destinies, I repeat, to be propped up in all ages by the arm of Infinite Power, and illuminated by Infinite Wisdom. Nothing can be more evident in ecclesiastical history than this elevation of the Church, from its earliest dawn, to the blessed Mother of our Redeemer. All the primitive Christians (and who would not listen to them in preference to any dogmatizing antagonist?) cherished the name of Mary with the most inviolable affection.

The awful sanctity of that woman who was selected by Almighty Pre-science to be the mother of Jesus, is contemplated by the Catholic Church in the present day precisely as it was in the primitive ages of the Church; and as my reverend friend has appeared to call this in question, I can only say, that if he will but condescend to open the pages of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, he will there find that it is so, even as it was in the case of all those saints who illustrated our Church in its earliest ages—all those glorious virgins who, ever mindful of their white baptismal garments, rushed with intrepid fortitude to martyrdom—a St. Agatha, a St. Barbara, a St. Catherine, a St. Cecilia, a St. Blandina, and all the long list of glorified saints, both male and female, who endured the sufferings of martyrdom, and now

wear its immortal, its unfading crown.

These, these, I say, holy virgins, the *spouse Christi*, as I will boldly call them, though the expression, I know, is a *gnasher of the teeth* to the cold-hearted Scotch Calvinist—these, together with all the glorified martyrs who passed through life pure and unsullied with the pollution of the world as the new-born babe, cultivated this same devotion to the queen of all purity, and unwearyingly solicited her aid, at their morning, at their noon, and at their evening prayers. So far from its being true that the Litany of Loretto—(that melody so sweet to my ear, but which is so harsh, so painful to the Athenian ear of my learned philosophic antagonist)—so far from its being true that the litany of Loretto was, as to the *cast of its expressions*, the product of some dark and some benighted age, as my learned antagonist will contend, they can be traced up by the closest evidence to the days of the Apostles; yes, they can be found in our most ancient records—records, whose authenticity it is not in the power of all the myrmidons of blaspheming Calvin to subvert. These liturgies stand out, in every age, as glorious and colossal monuments of our faith, preaching, in impressive and in feeling accents, the doctrine of primitive antiquity.

There is no exalted title struck out in the holiest raptures and transports of devotion, that, in their view, could adequately pourtray the blessedness, the prodigality of heavenly grace, which was bestowed by heaven upon the mother of Jesus. She was their acknowledged guide and protectress, without the least derogation from still more supernal aid. To her they prayed repeatedly, and with all the fervour which the words breathe in the liturgy of St.

James. Yes, in that magnificent effusion of apostolic holiness, which grates such harsh discord to the ear that has been long accustomed to the harmonies of the Scotch bagpipe [laughter], but which sounds so melodiously to those who, like the seraphic St. Augustine, have swelled their souls from the days of their infancy to the heaven-upraising peals of the loud Catholic organ. [Sensation.]

The words of St. James' liturgy are as follows:—"O mother of ineffable light, honouring thee with angelic hymns, we exalt, we magnify thy name. It is meet and just that we pronounce thee truly blessed, Mother of God, ever blessed, and in all the ways of thy life unblameable and pure! Mother of our God, in dignity and honour above the cherubim, and in glory above the seraphim; thou who, without spot or stain of human corruption, didst bring forth God the Word, thee truly do we exalt and magnify!"

"To thee, O full of grace, every created being pours forth its congratulation; the choir of angels and the assemblies of men! To thee who art the hallowed temple, the spiritual paradise, the glory of virgins, from whom God assumed flesh and became a child, the God who is before all ages! Truly did he make thy womb a throne, that heaven itself could not surpass in glory. The whole universe resounds with thy praise and congratulation, ever extolling thee our most holy, most undefiled, supereminently blessed queen, Mother of the Lord, O ever-Virgin Mary! Thou who didst bring forth the true God, pray to him, O Virgin, in our behalf, that he would bless and save our souls!"

Such, gentlemen, is the prayer to the Virgin, to be found in the liturgy of St. James the Apostle, and which is as sweet an unction to the

soul of a Catholic, as it is bitter to the soul, and will prove a source, if I can predict aught, of bitter-tongued reviling on the part of the modern divine who is about to address you.

You must have observed, my friends, in the liturgy of St. James, the expression, "*Spiritual Paradise*," applied to the Virgin; and I take this opportunity of adding another ancient authority, one which has not hitherto, I believe, fallen under the notice of my deeply-read, investigating friend of the Scotch Calvinistic, or rather I should say *unbenighted* church. It is to be found in the fragments of Dyonisius Alexandrinus, who wrote in the year of our Lord 260, published by Routh, a Protestant clergyman of the Church of England. It runs thus:—"For the only begotten God, who came down from heaven, was conceived and born of the Virgin Paradise, that possesses all things; or, as the Greek has it, *εχοντι τα παντα*. The Holy Ghost overshadowed her, and the holy thing that was born was the child Jesus—the mighty God, the powerful, endured the cross, despising the shame."

In addition to this, Theodoret tells us that, from the earliest antiquity, the heralds of the orthodox faith, according to apostolical tradition, taught us to name Mary, *Mother of God*. The word *θεοτοκος*, or Mother of God, is also to be found in Origen, in his Commentary on Deuteronomy xxii. and xxiii, and upon Luke. We find it also used in the disputation between Archelaus and Manes, in the year of our Lord 227.

After these documents, (hard pieces of digestion for my learned friend), to prove that not only our devotion to the Blessed Virgin, but that the very cast of expression

used by us as descriptive of her merits, when raised to the highest and most encomiastic strain, is of apostolic origin, have we Catholics, think ye, my Protestant friends, any reason to blush when we implore her intercession, rejoice in the sounds of her praise, and glory in her patronage?

No; we were persuaded—ay, let me tell my learned, my philosophically sermonizing friend, we are most unalterably persuaded, that, whilst we expatiate upon the glories of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, which are derived, though with an incomparably superior lustre, from the same source as that of all the other saints, that we do not derogate in the most slender degree from the adoration which is due to God alone. We do most solemnly declare, we Catholics present, in the name of hundreds of millions of Catholics over the whole world, that we never hear her blessed name pronounced without awakening the remembrance of our Redeemer, without an immediate incitement of pious reflection that centres ultimately, as it ought to do, in her divine Son, Christ Jesus! Where is the idolatry of such doctrine?

What low servility to terrestrial, down-groveling thoughts shall ever teach the Catholic to believe that the prayers of one living man offered up for another at the throne of grace and mercy are of the least avail; and to believe, at the same time, that the intercession in our behalf of the ever-blessed, ever-Virgin Mary, is of no validity? [Sensation.]

But it is time, as I am informed, to conclude suddenly; a warning I shall most willingly attend to, as I perceive the workings of a high impatience in the countenance of my learned antagonist.

[The learned gentleman's hour here terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I will plainly and honestly confess, my Christian hearers, that if it had been left to me to select a specimen of what I, as a Protestant, and what I know every Protestant in this assembly would pronounce to be gross idolatry, I should just have read those passages with which my learned antagonist concluded his speech. I make no comments on that most extraordinary extract; I leave it to speak for itself, and I know that it will speak to every Protestant heart with a terrible and resistless logic. I only wish every Roman Catholic, while he hears or reads it, to compare with it the simple language of Scripture recorded of St. Stephen, when he sealed his faithfulness by martyrdom:—"Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." I told, you, however, in reference to the hyperdoulia worship of the Virgin Mary—and more especially with reference to the extracts I brought forward corroborative of this most superstitious homage, that I should take occasion to pursue it still further; I shall, therefore bring forward further arguments next evening, when I shall restrict my observations, exclusively, to the practical worship which is given to the Virgin in the Church of Rome.

Mr. FRENCH.—This night [to the Rev. J. Cumming] finishes the subject.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I do not finish this evening.

Mr. FRENCH (rising).—I will allow you the time that you stop, if you will just let me explain.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Very well.

Mr. FRENCH (in explanation).—We agreed in the beginning that Transubstantiation and the other (the Sacrifice of the Mass) would probably take two nights, and that the others would afterwards take

one. But I am not pugnacious about it. [Laughter.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—My learned antagonist requested two nights for each subject—I, only one.

Mr. FRENCH.—And you did too, certainly.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Well, well, let it drop. Next evening I shall restrict my observations to the practical worship given to the Virgin, and I will show to you, my Roman Catholic friends, to demonstration, that if the now glorified and happy Virgin could come down to earth, she would call on you to silence for ever the idolatrous accents *Ave Maria*, and teach you to breathe in language, heartfelt and believing—*Abba—Father!* I told you exactly the course which my learned antagonist would pursue. He threatened twice or thrice to appear in clear water, into which I invited him; and, in my joy, I thought he would search among the apostles and evangelists at once; and I anticipated his testing every dogma by their words. But, the moment that he touched them, it seemed as if they had been infected with the plague, or some contagious fever; for he instantly rushed away, and plunged again into the dark depths of the muddy and contradictory fathoms.

On a previous evening I showed you, and I am prepared to satisfy my friend on the fact, that Cyprian, to whom he has appealed apparently so triumphantly, is, *de facto*, *anathematized by his own Church*—mark that! St. Cyprian disclaims, by implication, the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome; he says all the apostles were equal in jurisdiction, and therefore repudiates the supremacy of the Pope. But if St. Cyprian had dared to rise up in days when he could have been laid hold on, and to abjure

the supremacy of the Pope, or to affirm that Peter was equal to Paul or Paul to Peter, rest assured St. Cyprian would not have slept the next night in the bed in which he was accustomed ordinarily to repose. [Laughter]. I might show you, also, that St. Jerome virtually comes under the *anathema* of Trent, because he excludes the Apocrypha; I can show you that St. Augustine, "the glorious St. Augustine," is opposed to appeals to the Church of Rome—that St. Ambrose rejects the assumed *judicial* power of the priests—that St. Irenæus gives the Creed as the one only tradition—that St. Chrysostom (as St. Jerome did before him) advocates the indiscriminate reading of Scripture, and that St. Athanasius excludes the Apocrypha; and, before I have done with Mr. French on the Rule of Faith, I will make him cast every one of them overboard in the same style in which he has treated some of them on former occasions.

Now, in reference to the fathers, he has expressed himself to the effect that I have some sort of disease, for which he, in his own happy nomenclature, has found out a new word, or perhaps has coined it—namely, *patrophobia*. Now I distinctly protest that I have no fear from the fathers being brought forward. When he saw me, as he alleges, in a tremor, it was literally for my poor wandering antagonist, fearing he would again expose himself—running away from the word of God, and diving in the muddy depths of the misty fathers for illustrations and for proofs of this most extraordinary tenet. [Laughter.] I have no tremor on my own account. And why? "if God be for us, who can be against us?" If my antagonist had *all* the fathers on his side, which I most

completely dispute, and which I am prepared most clearly to disprove, yet if *one* apostle (as I have stated before) distinctly protested in favour of these truths which I hold, that apostle, let every one remember—even according to Mr. French's own admission—would be right, and all the fathers who contradicted that apostle would be utterly and necessarily wrong. I do not dread Mr. French's going to the fathers; I only deplore that he should play the undutiful part of a Ham, and expose their nakedness and their wretchedness; I would rather act the part of a Shem or Japhet, and, retiring, cast a mantle over them; I grieve only that they are dragged from their graves, and all their contradictions and their infirmities displayed before the eyes of sober and reflecting men. But my friend insists that their very ghosts shall be evoked from their sepulchres, that their mouldering ashes shall be disturbed; that their contradictions—their "knocking their heads one against each other"—as he himself most elegantly phrased it—shall be displayed to this assembly; he has boldly thrown down the gauntlet on the subject; I accept it, and will therefore show again to you what the fathers are, not according to Protestant authority, but according to the testimony of the learned of his *own church*, and, among others, the learned and celebrated Dupin.

The first statement which I shall advance on this subject, is the fact, that *we have not in our possession the EARLY FATHERS*. This now is a positive fact—we have not in our possession the EARLY FATHERS. We have only a few fragments of the second century; we have not got any thing like all the writings of the most celebrated fathers who lived in the *first and second cen-*

turies; we have but a handful. We have, I repeat—(and I want the reporter to place this fact in large letters)—WE HAVE GOT VERY FEW FRAGMENTS OF THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES. For this fact, I quote, as an authority, Dr. Delahogue, an authority which my friend will not dispute. This well-known professor of Roman Catholic theology in the royal college of Maynooth, page 232, *De Cultu Sanctorum*, says:—"But if in the first and second centuries many proofs of the Invocation of Saints are not to be found, this ought not to appear wonderful; for in those days, when persecutions raged, *the pastors of the Church were more solicitous about instructing and preparing the faithful for martyrdom than writing books. And, besides, very few monuments of those ages have reached us.*"

You observe, Delahogue asserts, "*Many proofs of the Invocation of Saints are not to be found in the first and second centuries.*" He gives the reason:—"This does not appear wonderful, for in those days, when persecution raged, the pastors were better employed than in writing books." This, then, was the *employment* of the early fathers:—"They were more anxious and solicitous about preparing their people for martyrdom than to be writing books. And besides," he adds, "*there are few monuments of those ages that have reached us.*" Now mark these words, my friends:—the fathers and early saints were too busy with their flocks to sit down and write elaborate treatises on Christian doctrine, and, therefore, *very few*, Dr. Delahogue says—very few of their writings have reached us. Now might it not so be that the very parts of the fathers that are lost—or the greatest part of the fathers

that are lost—may it not be that those very parts that are lost, might have contained *the strongest statements* we could possibly urge against the interpolated, mutilated, and corrupted fragments that have come down to us? Now that is my first position.

In the next place, I quote from the learned DUPIN. He says, in reference to the fathers of the Church prior to the fourth century of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 3, in the life of Eusebius: "For the most part these authors and their works, which were more ancient than Eusebius, have been lost since his death by the injury of time; and therefore we are mightily obliged to Eusebius, who has preserved in his history, not only the memory of those authors, but some considerable fragments of their works. *In short, without the history of Eusebius we should scarce have any knowledge, not only of the history of those first ages of the Church, but even of the authors that wrote at that time and their works, since no other writer but he has given account of those things.*"—Dupin, vol. ii. p. 3.

Dupin says, that "we have not the writings of the early fathers. We have merely some fragments without the context, which controversialists may twist and turn to sundry purposes."

All the writings of these fathers are some fragments contained in the history of Eusebius (the volume I hold in my hand), which I could almost put in my waistcoat pocket, if printed as books are now printed. So that, in short, without the history of Eusebius we should have no knowledge at all of them. In fact, we depend upon the *honesty* and *infallibility* of Eusebius for the words as well as correctness of almost all the fathers that preceded him. Delahogue admits they left

little behind them ; but a tenth part of that little we are not possessed of. This is the candid admission of the Roman-Catholic historian, Dupin, telling us that we have a *few fragments* only of the writings that were composed in the first and second and third centuries—that we obtain even these fragments at second hand—that we have not their distinct and separate works—that we are wholly indebted to a small history compiled by Eusebius, in which he has quoted passages from them, and thus preserved them.

My opponent's next remark (as far as I recollect) related to the sentiments entertained by St. Jerome on the Invocation of Angels and Saints. Now, mark you, whilst I show that the fathers are not Papists, I do not place one feather's weight on their authority. Though all the fathers said one thing, and the BIBLE said another, the Bible would be right (as I told you before) and the fathers would be wrong. But still I am not disposed to concede that feather, for I can show you that the Fathers contradict the Church of Rome even on vital questions, as I have often proved to you before. When you heard so many and so strange quotations from St. Jerome, you might instantly conclude that St. Jerome advocates the Intercession of Saints—that, in fact, this doctrine is held by him. You will, therefore, be anxious to know of what worth St. Jerome's authority is; because, as my friend has now given up St. Augustine, most magnanimously asserting, that "if St. Augustine says so and so, I take the liberty to differ from Augustine," I may also induce him to place St. Jerome in the same category. The whole force of my friend's battery has been directed from the fathers, and he has kept from the word of

God as from something that might palsy and paralyze his powers; and yet, most strange! he says, "if Augustine says so and so, I beg leave to differ from Augustine." I will, therefore, read you an extract relative to his next favourite—the illustrious St. Jerome; for the fickle advocate no sooner gives up one than he adopts another. Hear, then, from Dupin, the Roman-Catholic historian, of what value St. Jerome is. This opinion settles all Mr. French's quotations. I quote at page 103. Dupin says—"He ever argued on principles which made him contradict himself. His genius was hot and vehement. He fell upon his adversaries with fierceness. He often carries his subject too far, being transported with his ordinary heat; he commends, blames, condemns, and approves of things, according to the impression which they make upon his imagination. He often sets down the expositions of different commentators without altering any thing, and without naming those from whom he took them; nay, he introduced such explications as he did not approve himself." — *Dupin*, vol. iii. p. 103.

This is *Jerome*, mind you, from whom my opponent fired such a tremendous battery in favour of the Invocation of Saints! [Laughter.] "He teaches," continues Dupin, "that the angels may sin; upon the Epistle to the Ephesians, that Christ died for angels; and upon Ecclesiastes, that the sun and stars have souls. In St. Jerome's Commentaries there are also several opinions that savour of Jewish superstition and the too great credulity of the first Christians."

Now, perhaps, you will feel it your duty to throw St. Jerome overboard [to Mr. French], and treat him in the same cavalier style in

which you treated "the glorious" St. Augustine?

Again Dupin says: "If he is too scrupulous in some places, in others he seems a little too free." Dupin adds, that many of his most extravagant opinions "he rejected when he refuted Origen." P. 104. Origen was another father my opponent quoted. You say that the fathers are very unanimous! St. Jerome refutes Origen. This is Irish unanimity.

Dupin adds: — "St. Jerome sometimes gives allegorical senses to things which are to be understood literally. These are some of the faults which have been taken notice of in St. Jerome's Commentaries, and which crept in by the too great precipitancy with which he wrote them."

Now, here is the authority of a distinguished Roman Catholic historian, Dupin, on the merits of St. Jerome. I long to know, after this *exposé*, whether my friend will appeal to St. Jerome, or say, "Well, if St. Jerome says so and so, I beg to differ from St. Jerome." My learned antagonist does not, I find, approve of the phraseology applied by Don Carlos to the Virgin Mary, when he appointed her generalissimo of his forces in the recent war. I gave it you from the newspaper—the *Times* said so—I know it can tell lies [laughter] as well as the *Chronicle*, and, in fact, all the public prints of all shades of distinction. But I shall give you other illustrations as superstitious as these—quotations that have the seal and authority of the Church—quotations containing the most extraordinary tales concerning the saints and their marvellous doings. I shall read to you a few extracts from the works of the Bolandists. I stated in the outset of my remarks that the practice of the worship of

saints was a degrading and gross superstition—that the whole of Europe during the middle ages in consequence was deluged with lying fables. I have quoted one fact respecting this already; I shall, therefore, quote another from the life of St. Dominic, as recorded by the learned and distinguished Bolandists:—"Behold nine women of rank, entering the Church, fall at his feet, saying, 'O servant of God, succour us. If the things which thou hast preached to-day are true, the spirit of error has for a long time blinded our eyes; for we have given faith to those persons whom thou callest heretics, but whom we call good men, even up to the present day, and have adhered to them with our whole heart. But now we are in doubt. Aid us, O servant of God, and pray the Lord your God to make known to us his faith, that we may live in it, die in it, and be saved.'

"Then the man of God, standing for a short time, and praying within himself, shortly said to them: 'Be of good courage and firmly hope. I trust in the Lord my God, that he who desires no one to perish will now show to you the kind of master you have hitherto obeyed.' Immediately they beheld jump up from the midst of them a frightful cat, larger than a great dog, which had great flaming eyes, and a long broad and bloody tongue hanging out, which reached to the navel, with a short tail, tucked up behind, that exposed his hinder parts, and from him there issued an intolerable smell. And when he had turned here and there round the matrons, for the space of an hour, leaping up the bell-rope, and ascending by this means up above, he disappeared, slipping down by the steeple, and leaving the stench behind him.
—*De Sancto Dominico Confessore*,

August 4th. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. vi. *Antverpiæ*, 1688.

"It happened there also, that this man of God, who had watched till the middle of the night in prayer, departing from the Church, wrote by candle-light, sitting at the head of his dormitory. And behold the devil, who appeared in the form of a monkey, began strutting about before him, making ridiculous gestures with grimaces. Then the saint beckoned to him to stand still, giving him a lighted candle to hold before him, and he, although he held it, continued to make his grimaces. Meanwhile the candle was finished and began to burn the monkey's fingers, and he began to lament as if tortured by the flames, whereas, he who burns in the flames of hell ought not to fear a bodily flame. But the saint beckoned him to stand still. Why should I say more? He stood then until the whole of his forefinger was burnt down to the socket, crying out more and more loudly from the torture. Thus the man of God, strong in faith, having taken him in who sought to impose upon him, gave him a sharp blow with a cane, which he always carried with him, saying, Depart, thou wicked man; and the blow sounded as if he had struck a dry bladder full of wind. Upon this, casting himself against the nearest wall, he disappeared, leaving behind him a stench which discovered who he was. Truly, this man is to be extolled among the angelic powers, who so powerfully confounds and reproves diabolical wickedness.—*Acta Ampliora S. Dominici Confessoris*, August 14.

Now, mind you—[the laughter throughout the reading of these extracts was incessant.]

Mr. FRENCH.—[turning to Mr. Cumming.] If you do not wish to excite laughter, you had better desist.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I do not wish to excite laughter at all—I only wish——

A VOICE.—He is reading from a book—what business have you to interfere? [to Mr. French.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Now, remember, my friends, all that is disgusting is to be attributed to the distinguished Bolandists, best edition, bearing on it the sanction or *imprimatur* of the Church of Rome.

Mr. FRENCH.—No, no, no!

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I have a list of these most extraordinary legends [showing the book]. I have read you specimens from these Bolandists, who wrote under the sanction of the Church of Rome; and I have read to you from the life of St. Francis of Assisi, and shown you the pictures illustrative of some extracts, containing the most disgusting legends that were ever palmed on a credulous and misguided people. But all that is disgusting belongs to the Church of Rome, and those who sanctioned them, not, certainly, to him who drags them to light and exposes their errors and absurdity. If the statements of the Church of Rome will not bear the light, she must look to the pretensions of her doctors and her cardinals; for he whose deeds are right will not shrink from coming to the light, that they may be proved. To show you how truly these acts of the saints are authorized by the Church of Rome, you must recollect that her severe censorship was in the habit of sanctioning what she deemed good books, and of prohibiting bad books. I know the fact, that in the *Index Expurgatorius* some of the most important and distinguished works have been placed; but how happens it that these works of the Bolandists have never been put there? Now, is

it not strange that the Church of Rome should have so great disgust for these extracts professedly similar to the feeling which this audience has manifested, and yet should not have fixed them in the index? Why did not the censors of their books, who episcated all the claims of what books were to be prohibited and what to be allowed, why did they not prohibit these? Nay, I go further: Why have they, the accredited organs of the Roman Church, actually given their sanction and *imprimatur* to them? Why have they done so? Why did the censors of bad books and authorizers of good actually give their stamp and *imprimatur* to these writings? out of which I have give you but a disproportionate sample, whereas I might give you ten thousand of the same stamp.

But what is the drift of my remarks, when I state these things? All I wish is to bring your attention to this point—that the moment men leave the oracles of God, and begin to have recourse to the traditions and writings of man, no arithmetic can calculate the tremendous results that will follow, or the awful spirit of delusion into which they may be plunged. My friend asserted in his speech, that the Roman church alone has recourse to primitive antiquity, and we not. My learned antagonist knows that the word “primitive” is derived from the word *primus*, signifying *first*. Now, therefore, I ask, who were the *primi*, who were *first*?—who but the *apostles and evangelists*? That, surely, is primitive authority. They were the *primi*. I go to primitive antiquity. He dares not touch true primitive antiquity—the apostles and evangelists—because he knows they denounce his superstitious dogmas.

My friend next alluded, in no

cereemonious terms, to the members of the Church of Scotland, to Episcopalians, Baptists, Wesleyans, &c. To you I would say, my friends, You are worshipping God by the one only way; you can appeal to the apostles and evangelists for your doctrines. My antagonist dares not appeal to them for the Invocation of Saints. Again and again, my friend asserted, “I am coming to Scripture”—“I go to Scripture!” Now, I ask, did he produce *one* text from Scripture? Not one! Again and again he said, “I am not afraid of Scripture!” but he seemed to me like a child in the dark, who keeps calling out, “I am not afraid in the dark,” or whistles as he goes for want of thought, or in order to keep himself in good spirits; whereas he knows he is trembling at every inch lest something in the dark should lay hold of him. Again, he has made a statement to the effect, that he does not like to go to Glasgow and Edinburgh, and some of those places, for his theology, but that he wishes to go to primitive antiquity. Why then has he not gone to the Apostles and Evangelists, instead of wandering at so immeasurable a distance from them? To them he prefers Kam-schatka and Pekin. He has good reason for not going to Glasgow or to Edinburgh, for there are some good hard-headed men there who have learned from St. Paul the superstitions of the Mass, the absurdities of Transubstantiation, and the idolatries of the Invocation of Saints.

Now, as I know the only texts to which my opponent can refer, I will just draw out a few of his teeth, before he enters on his closing speech, which I do not dread, I assure you. My first reference is to the prophet Hosea, xii. 3. “He took his brother by the heel, in the

womb, and by his strength he had power with God. Yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him, he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us." Now, my friend, as usual, will quote that passage, and here he will *stop*; I venture to say he will stop here. He here finds that Jacob had power over the angel and prevailed; but just read the fifth verse that follows:—"Even *the Lord God of Hosts*; the Lord is his memorial,"—that is the angel, the Angel of Jehovah, the Angel of the Covenant, the mighty God, Wonderful Counsellor, the Prince of Peace, is the Lord God of Hosts. And to show you that I am not at all giving a fanciful interpretation of this, but a faithful and true one, I shall refer to the original account. Gen. xxxii. 24, 29:—"And Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name; and he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." There can be no mystery as to who this angel was, "over whom he had power and prevailed." Again, when we refer to Exodus iii. 2, we find, "THE ANGEL OF THE LORD appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire." This angel is declared to be Jehovah. "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name

for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

This great Being is expressly called the Angel Lord, who appeared unto Moses in the bush (v. 2). You will find the words "Jehovah" and "Angel" very distinctly synonymous terms; and, in fact, I will go to the original Hebrew, and give the precise words, and any Hebrew scholar in the room is at liberty to correct me. The words are Jehovah Melek, "the Angel Lord," the second person in the glorious Trinity, namely, Jehovah Messiah, or the Sent One. But the chapter from Hosea shows this angel who appeared in the burning bush, and Jehovah the Lord of Hosts, to be one and the same Being. "He made supplication unto the *Angel*; and now what is his name of the Angel? "THE LORD OF HOSTS is his memorial." So that there is not the slightest room for the adoration of angels and saints there. The Being adored is Jehovah.

Another passage quoted is—"And he blessed Jacob—blessed Joseph, and said——

Mr. FRENCH.—What is it?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It is from Genesis xlviii. 15. My friend will likely read the sixteenth verse and there stop. Now mark if I am not a true prophet in these things! "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the *God* which fed me all my life long unto this day, the *ANGEL* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." Angel and God, as the very grammar shows, are one; the God that did so and so—the Angel that did so and so—one single person is spoken of throughout; and

therefore the passage is an Invocation of God, but there is not one particle of proof here on the Invocation of Saints.

The next passage which my friend will most probably quote is, from the Book of Joshua, v. 13: "And it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand; and Joshua went unto him and said unto him, Art thou for us or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as Captain of the Host of the Lord am I come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant? And the Captain of the Lord's Host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy; and Joshua did so." Now I call your attention first to the words, "Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy;" for you will find that, when God appeared in the midst of the burning bush to Moses, (Exodus iii.) a parallel command was made, "Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." The parallel passages distinctly imply that the Captain of the Host whom Joshua worshipped was none other than Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts. Is not Christ also emphatically and distinctly declared to be in Scripture "the *Captain* of our Salvation?" And therefore, the more you look into this passage, and the more closely you analyze it, the more distinctly do you see that it refers exclusively to Christ, and that the worship here given was worship given to Christ. I have quoted passages in my first speech, and passages also in my last, all of which you observe have been tortured by the Church of Rome,

by a most subtle and extraordinary logic, into the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints; but all of which, when looked fairly in the face, demonstrate that worship is to be given to God only, and that "religious service" (in the language of Delahogue, which he says is to be given to saints,) is to be given unto God *only*. But when my opponent refers to the Old Testament, he errs; for, according to his Church, the Invocation of Saints under the Old Testament economy would be contrary to the principles of the faith; for then all the saints were *in limbo*, and if in limbo before the resurrection of Christ, there can be no proofs of Invocation of them prior to that. Having made these remarks, let me add, that I do not see the necessity there is (though this is not an argument, as I stated before) for the Invocation of Saints. I read in that sacred book, that God the Father has his most merciful bosom ever open to receive you; that God the Son intercedes for you on the right hand of the Father; that God the Holy Spirit dwells in the heart of believers, interceding for them "with groanings that cannot be uttered." This surely is enough!

In addition to this blessed truth, consider the completeness of the admission made by Delahogue, that all this worship or Invocation of Saints is not *de fide*—is not essential; therefore my friend might give it up with the greatest possible ease, without compromising his principles as a Roman Catholic.

Mark now, my friends, the glorious position in which Protestant Christianity places us. It tells us that we have God the Son interceding at the throne above; God the Holy Spirit interceding in our hearts within us; that thus we are borne up in the eternal arms of

God; and "if this God be for us on earth and in heaven, who can be against us?" What necessity (if so) can there be for the Invocation of Angels and Saints on the part of those who have such a Saviour at the right hand of the Father, and such a Holy Spirit dwelling within us?

I find the following happy illustration of the non-necessity of the interposition of saints, and the infinite delight of God to receive sinners:—Did the Prodigal Son, after he had ceased to feed on "the husks that the swine did eat," and had come to himself, say, "I will arise and go to my brethren?" No. To servants? No. To the saints? No; but, "I will arise and go to my *father's* house, for there is plenty!" And we read, that when the father saw him "a great way off" (his father was, no doubt, standing on some lofty eminence or tower of his castle, looking to see if there was the least shadow in the distant horizon—the least symptom of the return of the poor, penitent prodigal), and the instant he caught one glimpse of his return, he rushed forth to meet him, and welcomed him home with all the gladness of an anxious and affectionate father. My dear Roman Catholic friends, we have such a father in God in heaven! He stands in high heaven, looking out for the first movement of the returning penitent; and if you will only rise and leave the *husks* of the Church of Rome, and come to *your Father* and your God, the necessity of the interposition of saints will appear contemptible indeed; for God is willing, waiting, anxious—longing to receive you. Let this be your language this night—the language you breathe at the throne of grace:—"I will arise and go to my Father! and I will say to him, Father! I have sinned against heaven

and before thee! I will go to my father's house, for he has plenty to spare." And, rest assured, the sweetest anthem that will be heard in heaven will be heard over those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb—who have come to their Father, and found him indeed to be their Father and their God. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give the Spirit to them that ask him!" Ask of God as of a father. He looks upon you as his children; and if an earthly father will not refuse a gift to his earthly son, oh, much less will that Father, whose mercies are like the great mountains, and whose compassions are like the great deep—much less will he refuse your fervent and affectionate prayer!

Again, I find in Scripture, among very beautiful similitudes of the character of believers, one apposite to our present subject frequently referred to:—"They rise on eagles' wings." "He reneweth our youth like the eagle's." Now mark, if this be the fact, what valuable lessons does it necessarily lead to. You know the eagle builds its nest always on the highest rock—it never builds it on the ground: it never builds it in the furze-bush, but always on the highest cliff of the craggy rock. And thus should it be with you. Build your hopes, I implore you, on no creature short of the Almighty, the everlasting God, "the Rock of Ages," your "Fortress," your "High Tower," your "Rock." Again, it is well known that the eagle *rises higher than any other bird of the air*; he soars to a far greater altitude than any. Now you know what is the consequence of rising high above the earth. Those men who have ascended in balloons, and

who have looked down, have stated that St. Paul's cathedral appears no bigger than a black beetle. Thus will it be with you. The higher you rise, the less significant will all *creatures* on earth appear; and thus the nearer you rise to God and his glorious presence, the less the greatest saints will look. There is another fact respecting the eagle to which a believer is in Scripture compared. The eagle *always fastens his eyes upon the sun*. You might show him a burning torch, or the most splendid stars that stud the blue firmament, but he will not look at them; he rivets his bright eye on the blazing sun, the source of continual vitality and lustre; and so must you, my Roman Catholic friends. Rivet your eyes on Christ, the Sun of Righteousness; let no tiny glow-worm light of saint or of sinner take off your attention from him. Fasten your eyes intensely and entirely upon Christ by faith, who is gone into the immediate presence of the Father, who will make you kings and priests unto God. Through faith in Christ, call God your Father, and he will call you his sons and his daughters. There is yet another point of similitude between the eagle and a believer. When in the moulting season the eagle loses its feathers, it is a well-known fact, that the way he adopts to recover those feathers is to go out and bask in the sunshine, as every naturalist will tell you; when he has lost his plumage, he does not skulk into the cave, but basks in the sunshine. Even so do you—"In all time of your tribulation, in all time of your wealth, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment." Bask not in the taper-light of saints in heaven or saints on earth, but come to the glorious light of the Sun of Righteousness; court not, like the owls, and moles, and bats, the light of the stars and moon, and

the dark night; but, like the eagle, soar and seek the full light of the meridian day. I call on *you, sir*, [to Mr. French] to come out from the murky twilight of these moles and bats, the fathers and pseudo-saints of the Church, and assert your right to the full blaze of that light which is transmitted from the Sun of Righteousness, the source and fountain of all light.

My next remark from this similitude is a beautiful illustration of what believers should do. The circumstance of the eagle's fluttering over her young in the nest, and teaching them to engage with her in flight, is beautifully described in Deuteronomy xxxi. :—"As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them upon her wings, so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him." The eagle teaches and trains her young to rise and soar towards heaven, to fix their eyes on the sun. It thus forms a beautiful illustration of the way in which the faithful minister or parent would teach and train believers committed to his care. He is no minister of Christ who would teach you to fasten your eye on fathers or on saints, even the noblest and most illustrious of them all; but he *alone* is a true Christian priest who will teach you to rivet your eye on the Sun of Righteousness, to rise above the dusky atmosphere and the muddy element that saints and fathers grope in, and to pursue your course right upward and onward with firm and unwavering pinion toward that Sun in whose rays there is life, and under whose wings there is the healing of the nations.

[The reverend gentleman's hour here terminated.]

[Mr. FRENCH, on rising, experienced some little interruption, springing from what cause we are not aware; and the learned gentleman, before again entering on the subject, said, "I trust you will make as little noise as possible, and allow each of us fair play." The confusion increasing, the learned gentleman continued:—"I certainly cannot go on with this noise; it is utterly impossible."

JOHN KENDAL, Esq. (Catholic chairman) then rose, and succeeded in effectually restoring order.]

Mr. FRENCH again rose and spoke as follows:—I rise to answer, or rather to resist, not an overwhelming tide of argument, but a large, copious, and nauseating effusion of Calvinistic gall. Such, my friends, are the expressions that I use towards an adversary who adopts so ungenerous a proceeding as my friend has had recourse to this evening. I can bear to be called idolatrous, superstitious, and to be overloaded with all those epithets which no one but a gentleman of that persuasion would use when reasoning with a Roman Catholic—I can bear with such epithets, lavished upon me, as my reverend friend has poured out, night after night, since this discussion commenced: but to hear a gentleman, coming into this room, and most deliberately attributing to me that as an article of my creed which *he* knows not to be an article of it—to hear him solemnly and gravely ascribing to me concessions which it would be ridiculous on my part to make, and which I most unequivocally disclaim—such a disingenuous mode of proceeding, I say, on his part, is unworthy of a man who is bound by any honourable ties in the field of fair, amicable, argumentative disputation. I am really compelled

to tell him so, and to tell him, moreover—though he knows it well—that, notwithstanding his recent mighty soar into the regions of the clouds, with his "eagles," like another Pindar [laughter], he knows it is not in his power to daunt a man of my temper and calibre. No, he has neither power to intimidate me by those florid and high-sounding metaphors, that he has bandied about for years past from one end of England to the other, and those texts which he has committed so faithfully to memory [laughter], nor to perplex, by his exasperating language, the even flow of my thoughts, or disarrange the tenor of my systematic argument.

And now, gentlemen, having thus candidly declared my sentiments as to this indecorous behaviour of my learned friend, I cannot refrain from observing, that it is really a relief—a kind of anodyne to my wounded feelings, after listening so long to the infuriated declamation of wild, raving, unmitigable bigotry (though I am not courting, as I told you before, the smiles of the Church of England, or of any other denomination of Christians), but really, it is a kind of relief to me to cite the observations of a Bishop of the Church of England, after listening to the outrageous rhodomontade of my learned and reverend antagonist. [Laughter.] It is Dr. Montague, the Protestant Bishop of Chichester, who writes these remarks. His words, talking of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, are these:—*This is the common voice, with general concurrence, without contradiction of reverend and learned antiquity, for aught I could ever read or understand; and I see no cause or reason to dissent from them touching intercession in this kind.*—Dr. Montague, p. 103.

Mark, my friends, the expression of this fair and honourable opponent of Catholicity, this Protestant bishop of the Church of England—mark the expression—*with general concurrence, without contradiction of reverend and learned antiquity*; yes, that reverend and learned antiquity which my learned and reverend antagonist despises and sets at nought, as being constituted of nothing more nor less than so many *fac-similes* of us Catholics at the present day, namely, men unlearned, idolatrous, unapostolic, unbiblical. But let me cheer, if possible, the darkening brow of my reverend friend, with another little quotation from this calm-reasoning bishop of the Church of England:—“*I grant (he says) Christ is not wronged in his mediation: it is no impiety to say, ‘Holy Mary, pray for us,’ ‘Holy Peter, pray for me.’ I see no repugnancy at all to holy Scripture to say ‘Holy angel guardian, pray for me.’*”

The other Protestant divine alluded to is the Reverend Dr. Thorn-dike, Prebendary of Westminster, c. xxii. 159. His words are:—“*This doctrine may be proved by the same arguments as common Christianity is proved, namely, by the Scriptures interpreted by the perpetual practice of God’s Church.*”

I say, gentlemen, it is a relief, after hearing my learned friend, to listen to the calm, plain reasoning of a bishop of the Church of England; and it ought, and would, no doubt, make the cheek of the learned gentleman blush deeply, had it not been so long estranged to such an honourable suffusion. [Laughter.] In one of the towering flights of the learned gentleman’s eloquence, looking down triumphantly from the clouds, he advised us Catholics to throw away, with ineffable disdain, the Intercession of Saints, which we had received from the tradition

of ages, and which I will cling to to my very latest breath with pure unsullied conscience, unreproached as it is by *learned and reverend antiquity*, and unsolicitous as it is concerning the suffrages of unlearned and impious modernism.

My reverend friend tells us to cry out—*Abba, Father!* as if we never offered up a prayer to the God of the universe, as if we neglected to adore with all the powers of our soul, our crucified Saviour. I will answer his virulent and malignant declamation against us (for such it really was) by endeavouring to persuade you that we are by no means such aliens to that pure and genuine worship which he tells us it is the duty of a Christian to offer, by showing you a little humble effusion of my own, in honour of my blessed Redeemer. It flowed warm from my heart—it was the effort of a few moments, nay, I might almost say of an instantaneous glance at the glorious original, the Latin of St. Bernard. I shall beg leave, therefore, to read it to this assembly, in order to prove to my Protestant brethren, that we Catholics know how to pray to the blessed Jesus, with all the fervour, all the unction of souls nurtured with the true bread of life. When I shall have read it, it will prove sufficiently to this audience, without the necessity of any other argument, that we Catholics need no exhortation from our sermonizing antagonist, in order to stimulate us to love with ardour the blessed, the immortal Jesus. Its diction may be poor, jejune, and unornamented; but this I know—that its substance could have flowed from no other source than that of the hallowed fountain of the Catholic Eucharist.

O Jesus! name to memory dear,
Embalmed with many a grateful tear,
The thoughts of thee with sweets my bosom fill,
But oh! thy presence is far sweeter still

No sound in heav'n or earth is heard
So sweet as that melodious word,
That sweetest charm by which all hearts are
won,
The name of Jesus, God's eternal Son!

O glorious day-spring, heav'nly morn
Of sinners desolate, forlorn!
To seek thee, Jesus! is a sweet employ,
But oh! to find thee, who can tell the joy?

Jesus! true sweetness and delight!
O living fount of splendour bright!
Filling the bosoms that in thee believe
With joys no tongue can tell, no heart
conceive!

Alas! how languid and how faint
Is eloquence thy sweets to paint!
'Tis he that tastes thee who alone can know
What streams of joy the raptur'd soul
o'erflow.

O Jesus! King of power divine,
Whose glories so triumphant shine;
Sweetness ineffable! eternal fire,
Consuming with insatiable desire!

O source of bliss, with me remain,
Sole monarch of my bosom reign,
And whilst all tongues thy heav'nly deeds
proclaim,
Shed o'er the world the sweetness of thy
name!

This anthem, O celestial King,
With heart devout to thee I sing,
That when death spreads around its gloomy
shade,
My soul, sweet Jesus! may enjoy thy aid.—
AMEN.

Rev. J. CUMMING [in an under-
tone.] That is scriptural.

MR. FRENCH.—That is the little
tribute which, in my humble efforts,
I have paid to my divine Redeemer;
it came, as I told you, warm from
a heart glowing with love for him,
who for me bled and agonized on
Mount Calvary; but oh! may this
hand whither—may this heart cease
to beat within me—nay, may this
tongue be blasted, if ever it forget
to implore the intercession of that
transcendently glorious saint, his
ever-blessed Mother!—ay, if I ever
forget to resound with joy, in unison
with hundreds of millions of Catholic
tongues, in every part of the uni-
verse—"Hail Mary, full of grace,
our Lord is with thee! blessed art
thou amongst women, and blessed
is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus!

Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray
for us sinners now, and at the hour
of our death. Amen."

We have been taught to apply it
by all the doctors of the Church of
God—by the uninterrupted voice of
tradition, which cannot be invali-
dated by the finest flourishes of my
learned friend's ever gaudily-spread-
ing and oriental rhetoric. We have
have been taught it by the holiest
men that ever breathed upon this
earth—the holiest fathers of the
Church, and the holiest women that
ever adorned the history of Chris-
tendom. I will not, therefore,
listen to you, sir [turning to the Rev.
Mr. Cumming] when you sermonize
me and my fellow-Catholics, in the
plenitude of your wisdom; no, sir,
I stand in need of the prayers of
the saints; and when the awful hour
of death approaches, as I shall not
go to the great tribunal with the
confidence of a *Calvinist*, who is a
child of the covenant—a child of
predestination—a child of the self-
explained gospel—a child of pre-
ordained glory; certain of the
realms of bliss hereafter; certain,
not only for himself, but for all his
posterity—as, I say, I am not one
of those self-exalted beings, but one
that will go trembling to appear in
the awful presence of my God; so
shall I not cease to the last hour of
my existence to cry out, in the
language of the Church—"Oh,
blessed Mary, Mother of my God,
pray for me, a poor miserable sinner;
smooth, by thy holy intercession
with thy divine Son, this my awful
passage from time to eternity!"

Yes, my Protestant friends, listen-
ing to the voice of the Church which
has existed in every age, I am en-
joined thus to do—and, as I told
you at the commencement of this
dispute, if you can show me any
other Church ever co-existent with
it, and if you can trace the exist-

ence of any other Church in every age, save and except the Catholic Church, I will become a member of it to-morrow. And now, gentlemen, if I may bestow a few words on my very reverend and learned friend, who has lavished so many on me, I must, in all equity, give him credit for possessing a vast torrent of "oriental" eloquence; he can talk of eagles, and bats, and moles, and draw from them, as well as from ten thousand other birds and reptiles in existence, beautiful, apt, ingeniously-wrought, unexceptionable metaphors and similes; in one word, whatever he chooses to take for the subject of his oratorical amplification, he is ever extremely happy, and at times original; the only fault I have to find with him (and *that* in polemical discussion is a mortal sin) is, that he is *never* argumentative. And yet, my friends, grievous as this imputation which I cast upon him undoubtedly is, would to heaven it were the greatest of his faults; but no, my reverend antagonist calumniates the holy fathers of the Church, and is actually guilty of blasphemy when he talks of tenets which they held sacred, and which they have transmitted in their writings to all posterity; expressed in language too plain to be either clouded or distorted, even by the artful sophistry of a Calvinistic theologian. Let me, therefore, my friends, let me now invite you—after having heard so often the accents of blasphemy—let me now beg you to listen to the accents of holiness and truth from the pens of those whom he has so unwarrantably calumniated. You have heard the fathers of the Church misrepresented, and I shall, therefore, now rectify these misrepresentations. The learned gentleman tells you that St. Jerome contradicts himself, and is not our advocate,

and that St. Cyprian was not a father of the Catholic Church. Now I happen to have their words, their sentiments, in my own little book; and I think it time to quote them, in order that I may expose such an erroneous assertion of Calvinistic audacity, for I will not offend by saying Calvinistic disregard of truth. St. Jerome writes a letter to Pope Damasus, in which he thus confounds either my learned friend or me. These are his words:—"Beati-tudini tuæ, id est Cathedræ Petri, communionem consocio; super illam petram ædificatum Ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, profanus est; si quis in arca Noe non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio:" "I am linked in communion with your Holiness; that is, with the chair of St. Peter. Upon that rock I know that the Church was founded. Whosoever out of this building shall eat the Lamb is unholy. He that shall not be found within the ark of Noah shall perish in the overwhelming deluge."—*St. Jer. Epist. ad Pap. Damasum.*

Now, my friends, after this extract, listen, if you can, with Christian patience to my reverend antagonist, whilst he endeavours to persuade you that St. Jerome and St. Cyprian were not sons of the Church of Rome!

The fact is this, and it is just what I allowed him in the beginning, and I repeat it again:—In all the fathers, Greek and Latin, there may be certain discrepancies, certain differences, upon minor points; but what I maintain most strenuously is, that they all cling inseparably to the chair of St. Peter, the Great Head, appointed by the holy Founder of the CATHOLIC RELIGION. The learned gentleman, if he have grace sufficient to try the experiment, might enter into our Church to-morrow, and not violate any essential

commandment of that Church, if he never uttered one prayer to the Blessed Virgin, or to angels or saints; but he would certainly be estranged from a very salutary practice, according to the tradition of ages. But if my reverend friend can show that St. Cyprian or St. Jerome disapproved of such a practice, and branded it with the name of "superstitious and idolatrous," he then would come forward with something like solid objection to the practice, instead of that wild incoherent declamation which now renders him so weak and powerless as an argumentative reasoner.

To come now to St. Cyprian. He wrote about the year 250. Was he a Catholic, or was he a Protestant? If you ask St. Cyprian himself, in his works, he says most clearly and emphatically, *yes*, he is a *Catholic*—if you ask the Reverend Mr. Cumming, he says, most audaciously, *no*, he is not. Read then his letters, and judge for yourselves, whether a more faithful and devoted son of the Church of Rome ever existed than St. Cyprian. There was, I confess, a difference existing between him and the Pope concerning baptism, which it would take time to explain. I will, however, go over it in as rapid a manner as possible; and that is what my friend alludes to, I suppose. St. Cyprian affirmed of heretics, that their baptism was not valid, even although they should be properly baptized by water, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

This was the contested point with him and the Pope; but it is well known by every one acquainted with the character and humility of St. Cyprian before martyrdom, that if he had heard the decision of the Church, and what that decision said, namely, that baptism, though admin-

istered by a priest in an heretical Church, if administered properly as to the mode, is valid, and is not to be repeated; had St. Cyprian, I say, lived to hear this decision promulgated, St. Augustine, as well as all the Catholic writers of the time, loudly testify that he (St. Cyprian) would have most submissively and instantaneously bowed his head to the voice of the Church. Indeed, the least acquaintance with the writings of that saint would easily convince any unbiassed reader, that such would have been his conduct, in that much-agitated question; yes, that he would have been the very first to show docility and submission to the chair of the great St. Peter.

To prove this, let us open his works. Listen, I beseech you, most attentively:—"Deus unus est, Christus unus, una Ecclesia, et Cathedra una, supra petram Domini fundata; aliud altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum altare, et unum sacerdotium, non potest:" "*There is one God, one Christ, one Church, one Chair, founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock. No other altar can be erected, no other priesthood can be instituted, but the one altar and the one priesthood.*"

Again: "Adulterum, impium, sacrilegium est, quodcumque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio divina violetur:" "*Every institution that is engendered by the madness of man, in violation of this divine economy, is adulterated, is impious, is sacrilegious.*"

Again, writing to certain persons who had associated themselves with heretics in their devotions, the saint exclaims—"Ne putetis vos Evangelium asserere, dum vosmetipsos à Christi grege, et ab ejus pace et concordia, separastis:" "*Do not imagine that you can thus profess*

the Gospel of Christ, you who have separated yourselves from the flock of Christ, and from its peace and concord."

Again: "Cum Deo manere non possunt qui esse in Ecclesia unanimiter noluerunt." "*They cannot be with God, who would not abide unanimously in the Church.*"

Nay, he goes further, and asserts what will immediately direct the mind to Protestant martyrs like *Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, &c.*—"Inexpiabilis et gravis culpa discordiæ est, nec passione purgatur. Esse martyr non potest, qui in Ecclesia non est." "*The guilt of discord in matters of faith is enormous, is inexpressible. It is not to be washed away by sufferings. He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church.*"

In another place, writing concerning certain persons who had fallen into heresy, he says,—"*Si aliquis eorum fuerit apprehensus à persecutoribus, non est quod sibi in confessione nominis Christi blandiatur, cum constat, si occisi ejusmodi extra ecclesiam fuerint, fidei coronam non esse, sed pœnam potius esse perfidiæ, nec in domo Dei inter unanimes habitatores esse, quos videmus de pacifica et divina domo furore discordiæ recessisse.*" "*If any one among them should be seized upon by the persecutors (of Christianity), let him not soothe himself with the flattering thought that he confesses the name of Christ! since it is certain that should persons of this description be even put to death, that it is not to be considered as the crown of faith, but rather as the punishment of perfidy, and that those whom we see receding, in the fury of discord, from the divine house of peace (the Church) shall not be inhabitants of the celestial mansions, where all is perfect unanimity.*"

Such were the sentiments of the

holy Cyprian as to those Christians who, valuing themselves upon the strength of their own understandings, and disdaining to be guided, like "children of obedience," by the ever visible, ever inspired Church, fondly persuaded themselves that they could either lead a life or die a death pleasing to God, in a state of total disconnection from its sacred pale. Nor was this doctrine peculiar to St. Cyprian: St. Augustine, speaking of one who had shed his blood for the true religion, says of him—"Martyr est, non quia pro Christi nomine, sed quia pro Christi nomine in gremio unitatis occisus est." "*He is a martyr, not because he was slain for the name of Christ, but because he was slain for the name of Christ being in the bosom of unity.*"

So that, my friends (what I principally wish to inculcate by these quotations), you may see, most clearly, that a Cyprian, endued with such sentiments, would instantaneously have renounced his opinion concerning *re-baptization*, had he not been martyred previous to the grand decision of the Church; that is, had he lived to have it announced to him.

But now let me grapple with my learned friend more closely. In order to prove that the doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints is not only *unprofitable* but *unscriptural*, he tells me of Daniel, and of Solomon, and of Moses, and of a long catalogue of others who in ancient times obtained blessings of God without the importunity of saint or angel to assist them; he tells me what he finds recorded in the Bible upon those respective patriarchs: and it is now high time for me to tell him what I also find recorded in that book, which, whilst he takes it in his hand as his rule of faith, is the cause of all his wander-

ings, owing to the contracted manner in which he peruses it. Accordingly, I find, with regard to those blessed spirits whom my learned antagonist represents as so powerless in the cause of man, that St. Paul differeth from him; and, without the least intention of showing disrespect to my learned friend, I must avow, that I prefer St. Paul's authority to that of the Reverend Mr. Cumming. Speaking of angels, the apostle says—"Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who are the heirs of salvation?"—Heb. i. 14.

Again, I read in the Psalms:—"For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways." (Psalm xci.) And again, I find, what the perspicacity of my Bible-reading friend, it seems, has never yet been able, or at least willing, to discover (for he is not a man likely to open his eyes when he thinks it seasonable to shut them); I find that angels, according to his rule of faith, the Bible itself, have not only prayed for man, and been prayed to by man, but I find the prayers of each recorded by the prophet, to the eternal confusion of all gainsayers—my very reverend antagonist not excepted.

And first, my friends, you shall hear man praying to an angel:—"The angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads." Now, here, if my learned friend should contend that this was Christ, not an angel, as his infallibility will no doubt declare it, I as boldly deny the Protestant deduction; let appearing angels not be confounded, I say, with the great God of heaven, whom no mortal man in this world, if Scripture speak truth, "can see and live." But by what ingenious distortion will my reverend opponent make the prayer of the angel for Jerusalem, as recorded in Zecha-

riah, fade into evanescence, when I shall have placed it in full blaze before him?

Listen to its solemn accents! Listen, ye Catholics, with joy and triumph, and thou, my reverend friend, with confusion and dismay:—"Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah; against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?" "And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me, with good words, and comfortable words." (Zach. i. 12, 13.)

See ye, my Protestant friends, in demolition of all my friend's towering arguments, that the angel not only prayed for men, but obtained a favourable answer to his supplication? See ye not, that He who says in Psalm xci. 2—"For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways," gives us angels that know how to sympathize with us in our miseries—not cold, marble-hearted beings, such as the frigid philosophy of my Calvinistic friend would depicture? And when he cries out, as he has done, How can angels possess the faculty of *omnipresence* or *ubiquity*? I cry out, in my turn, to him as loudly, to explain to me (for he can explain anything) how it is, by what process it takes place, that the angels of the little ones "do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," (Matt. xviii. 10,) and yet should at the same time "be ministering spirits sent to minister for them who are the heirs of salvation?" Whilst they are full of solicitude for the heirs of salvation here below, how can they always behold the face of God in heaven? Let my friend, I say, answer this, or cease to talk about ubiquitous, omnipresent angels. There is not, I

am well aware, any theological complication throughout the whole of Scripture which my ingenious friend cannot in an instant analyze into its just principle. I shall be curious to see his experiment upon this.

But, to follow the learned gentleman as closely as I am able, he tells me, that Christ stood by the silent and mouldering dead, and said, "Come forth!" and Lazarus came forth! Yes, I answer, I know the fact as well as you do, and believe it quite as firmly; but I know, at the same time, that he who *called Lazarus out of his grave, and raised him from the dead*, (St. John xii. 17,) he, I say, Christ, *ὁ τοῦ ἡλίου ποιητής, the Creator of the solar orb*; who might, with equal facility as that with which he resuscitated dead Lazarus, have bidden light to rekindle in the orbits of the blind, at one time thought proper *to touch them*, and by the efficacy of that touch *their eyes were opened*. (Matt. ix. 30.) At another time "*he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said to him, Go and wash in the pool of Siloam, which is, by interpretation, Sent. He went his way, therefore, and washed, and came seeing.*"

Now, knowing all this as I do, I ask, if my learned antagonist be true to his principles, and reasons consequently, why does he not here exclaim, What need of the instrumentality of the simple touch, at one time, and *of the clay made of spittle* at another, in order that the omnipotent Creator should dart a ray of light into the eye-balls of a benighted creature? And yet, my Protestant friends, a strain of reasoning parallel to this is that by which your own cloud-capt orator would reason you into blindness, and would shade your eyes, lest they should perchance behold, with firm

faith, like that cultivator of all purity in thought, word, and deed—the Catholic—your guardian angels for ever at your side.

Again—when the Centurion "*sent unto Jesus the elders of the Jews, beseeching that he would come and heal his servant,*" (Luke vii. 3.) I behold the Lord of heaven and earth approached by those who were *mediators*, and I behold those *mediators* sent by one who might have gone himself to the *Son of man*, relying on the comprehensive and attractive declaration (to use *ipsissima verba*, the very words of my friend), "*Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.*" Again, when Mary, the blessed mother of my Lord Jesus, procures the water to be turned to wine at the feast of Cana, those that were solicitous for the wine saw before them him that created the source from which wine flows; they saw him, I say, and yet they had recourse to Mary; and Mary, without one word from the blessed Jesus, significative of his intent to perform a miracle "*before his hour was yet come,*" (John ii. 4,) bids the vessels to be placed in order, and "*the water was made wine.*" (v. 9.) Now tell me, my Protestant friends and attestators of the truth between us, does not this, to use the expression of the Evangelist, *manifest forth* the intercession of Mary; this same miracle, I say, by which *was manifested forth* the glory of the Almighty Jesus?

And now one word as to the worshipping of angels alluded to by St. Paul—namely, "*Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels.*" (Coloss. ii. 18.) My learned friend knows full well that we Catholics abominate that species of worship, at least as much as he does; and I know that we abominate it more, inasmuch as we shudder at all heresy

—he only at this and some others. But what, after all, is the meaning of this passage? Why it is simply this, as he well knows, but will not have the candour to communicate to his metaphor-gaping, swallowing admirers:—The apostle is branding the wicked doctrine of Simon Magus and others, who taught angels to be our mediators, and not Christ, and prescribed sacrifices to be offered to them, meaning indifferently the bad angels as well as the good; against which doctrine St. Augustine disputes, (lib. 8, 9, 10, *de Civit. Dei*,) as he condemns also the same worship (lib. 10, *Confess.* cap. 42,) and which same doctrine is condemned also by St. Jerome, (10, *ad Aglasium*,) and yet this same St. Jerome, as I have proved to you before from his writings, brands Vigilantius as a heretic, for having attempted to eject from the Christian creed the apostolic usage of Invocating Angels and Saints. But my learned antagonist still goes on floundering in his usual manner. He says, quoting Heb. vii. 25—“*He (Christ) is able to save, to the uttermost, all that come to God through him.*” I grant it, is my reply; but does that hinder souls from coming to God through St. Paul, or St. Peter, or through the Virgin Mary? Listen to St. Paul, for I know my learned friend will not join with *all generations* in calling the Mother of God *blessed*:—“*If by any means I might provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and save them.*”—Rom. ii. 14.

“What! St. Paul, canst thou save souls?” I should be apt to exclaim, had I been tutored in Calvinistic schools—but no! I see, at one glance, the meaning of St. Paul—he means to say (and I submit it to the judgment of my *infallible* friend), Through my instrumentality, my preaching, my prayers, “that I might save them;” according to the

inculcation of the apostle James:—“*And pray for one another that ye may be healed!*” (James v. 16.) The old question, therefore, here recurs again—If prayers by one man, living on earth, offered up for another, be *efficacious*, according to my sound, orthodox antagonist, by what oracular authority is it denounced as *inefficacious*, when offered up by one, we will suppose, who has just shed his blood for Christ Jesus, and arrived in his holy presence? Does the presence of Christ torpify, deaden, extinguish the all-conquering energy of prayer? Oh the mighty sovereignty of death over the soul that has been once unfettered from its corporeal clogs! The gates of heaven, where *the Church triumphant* sits crowned with glory, the very moment they have obtained their celestial palms, are immediately barred against all communication with *the Church militant* on earth; or, to define Calvinism still more accurately, instead of *sleeping in the Lord*, the good old phrase used for dying, in primitive antiquity, their gloomy doctrine virtually, though not professedly, is, *Death is an eternal sleep*—how then can the saints hear us? Whereas the Catholic still cries out, and will never cease to cry out to his God, even whilst he is here on earth, conscious as he is of their innumerable surrounding wings, in the language of the Psalmist, “I will praise thee with my whole heart; in the sight of the angels I will sing praise unto thee.” (Ps. cxxxvii. 1.)

The Catechism of the Council of Trent, moreover, explains to us with the utmost clearness and precision, and with all coherence and propriety, the vast difference there is between imploring God, and that of imploring the intercessory assistance of saints. Its explanation is—“*We pray to God either to grant*

us good things, or to deliver us from evil; but because the saints find greater favour and acceptance in his sight than we, we beg of them to plead in our behalf, and to obtain of God for us whatsoever graces we deem most needful. Hence it is that we make use of two forms of prayer, widely different from each other; for to God we properly say, *'Have mercy on us, hear us!'* but to a saint we say, *'Oh pray for us;'* by which we are given to understand, in whatever terms the prayers addressed to saints are couched, the intention of the Church and of the faithful reduces them always to this form and this combination. The words of the Council itself are, that *'the saints who reign with Jesus Christ offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and salutary humbly to invoke them, by recurring to their prayers and assistance, in order to obtain benefits from God through Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour.'*" In fact, it is only through Jesus, and his name, that we obtain anything through the mediation of the saints; because the saints themselves pray only through the mediation of Jesus Christ, and are heard only in his name. As to the objection against this apostolic practice which has been most insisted upon by apostates from the Catholic Church—namely, that by addressing our prayers to the saints we ascribe, as it were, omnipresence or ubiquity to them, or at least a power of discerning what passes in the inmost recesses of the human mind—it cannot, surely, be exalting the creature above the possibility of his exaltation to say, that he has some knowledge of things which God communicates to it. The example of the prophets, to whom God was pleased to manifest even the secrets of futurity, though these

appear to be much more peculiarly reserved to his own infinite knowledge, is incontrovertible evidence of the point in question;—indeed, will the reverend theologian whom I am combating deny that God Almighty could, if it so pleased him, dart into my mind, at the present moment, the knowledge of transactions that are going forward in the remotest regions of the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America? No Catholic, however, ever imagines that the saints of *themselves* are acquainted with our necessities, or the desires of our souls, whilst we are addressing them. The Church, says the illustrious Bossuet, remains satisfied with teaching, as all antiquity has taught, that these prayers are exceedingly profitable to such as have recourse to them; whether the saints comprehend us by the intercourse or ministry of angels, who being established ministers of God in the work of our salvation, know, as the Scripture testifies, what passes amongst us; or whether God himself discovers his desires to them by a particular revelation; or, in one word, whether he discloses the secret to them in his infinite essence, where all truth whatsoever is comprehended. So that the Church has decided nothing as to the means which it may please God to employ for this purpose, though my learned antagonist has most peremptorily decided, in his own oracular bosom, that no means whatsoever can be devised, even by Omnipotence itself, for them to attain it.

But, be those means what they may, it is a certain truth, that no one of the Divine perfections is attributed to created beings by the Church as was attributed to them by the idolaters whom St. Paul stigmatizes, and whom my reverend friend so charitably confounds with us; since it does not acknowledge,

even in the most eminent of the saints, any degree of excellence that does not emanate from God, nor any distinction in his sight which does not arise from their virtues, nor any virtue *that is not a gift of his grace*, nor any knowledge of human affairs but what he communicates, nor any power to assist us but that which they exert by prayers, nor any other bliss or felicity than that which springs from a perfect conformity and submission to his divine will. Hence it is easy to collect, what kind of honour, how different from the *θρησκεία των αγγέλων*—the divine *worship of angels* alluded to by St. Paul we give exteriorly, the exterior worship being established as a testimony of the interior homage of the soul; and if we sometimes entreat the saints not to pray, *but to give and act*, every instructed and educated man must know that the ancients did so likewise, and, like us, understood it in that sense, which attributes favours received not only to the sovereign who distributes them, but also to the intercessors who obtain them. Upon this article, therefore, as upon all others, we should be tried by our own professed tenets, not by the distorted rules of our calumniating adversaries, one of the most virulent of which, I must say, is the reverend gentleman with whom I am contending.

And now, gentlemen, permit me to lay before you another very pregnant text from the New Testament, a book, which, if we may believe our learned friend, is no magnet of attraction in the eye of a Catholic:—"I say unto you that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance. Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of

God over one sinner that repenteth."—Luke xv. 7, 10.

The reason, my friends, that induces me to bring this text before you, after having already crushed my antagonist by so many texts that he has not yet recovered from their stunning noise and re-echo, [laughter,] is simply this:—I made, the day before yesterday, a little excursion into the country, to a place called Thatcham, not very far from Reading in Berkshire; and the object of that excursion was to enter the lists of theological disputation with some part of that declamatory brotherhood of my learned antagonist, who had just lighted in that village, in that *grand tour* of charity which they annually make in this country, to inflame the breasts of men with love for the Bible and hatred to their Catholic neighbour. Accordingly I attended the meeting which the holy peregrinators had convened in a large barn holding about five hundred auditors, ladies, gentlemen, farmers, farmers' wives and daughters, and rustics of every description, to whose purses a most powerful appeal was in turns made by six or seven clergymen of the holy brotherhood above alluded to. I waited a long, a very long time, in hopes of finding some plausible opportunity of interjecting, if possible, some few words of mine, to season the dull uniformity of endless repetition on the part of the reverend declaimers. This, you may easily conceive, soon presented itself, when the patience of the audience began to be exhausted by their never-ending speeches. Some way or other, one of the orators, rolling about his eyes from one side to another in quest of some new subject to speak upon, hit upon this very text to which I just called your attention, and immediately taking it up with great delight, "O yes (he

exclaimed) there is no doubt of it—the angels of heaven are at this blessed moment looking down upon the good inhabitants of Thatcham, as well as upon the Bible that lies on that table, and on that plate which lies near it ready to receive, my pious and zealous friends, those contributions which I am not so unskilled in penetration into the human character, as not to know will flow into it largely from the inhabitants of Thatcham, especially from the ladies.” Here, as you may easily imagine, there was loud applause, when, instead of the plate, I rose up.

“Gentlemen,” said I, “as one of the Roman Catholic persuasion, I beg leave to say a few words, not against the Bible, the contents of which I would gladly see prospering throughout the land, but a few words in defence of my much beloved and revered Doctor Milner, whom one of you has so grossly slandered, as one who threw every impediment in the way to the diffusion of the Bible. Gentlemen, it is not so; nor do we Roman Catholics imbibe from our pastors any other sentiments with reference to that holy book, than those of the holiest awe and most profound veneration. Nay, sir, being myself deeply versed in that sacred volume, I was quite delighted to find, from your recent quotation from it, that you acknowledge that the angels of heaven *do know* what is passing here, since, according to you, they are now looking down upon that Bible, and panting, as it were, for the speedy circulation of that plate, which I am sorry to say I have somewhat retarded by my unseasonable rising.” Here some turbulence of opposition beginning to manifest itself, I sat down, amidst loud applauses, and not a few hisses. Resuming, however, my speech, I

cried out with a thundering voice,—“But give me leave to ask you, reverend gentlemen, why, when the Catholic prays for the intercession of angels and saints, you laugh at him, as praying to those who, having not ubiquity or omnipresence, cannot hear him; and yet have the fond credulity to imagine that, aroused by your clamours, they are now looking down upon the Bible and the plate; yes, that they are now clothed with ubiquity, with omnipresence!” And, my friends, this same question I now put to my reverend antagonist, who has been listening to this anecdote, which has created so many smiles around me, but which he has heard with such undisturbed gravity of countenance. [Laughter.] I shall, therefore, now only observe, gentlemen, that from this grand text alluded to, without the least glance at any plate circulating for my interest, that I do most seriously collect, that the angels and saints of heaven do take a lively interest in what is spiritually going forward among the members of the church militant here on earth; one of the members of which glorious church militant I flatter myself I am, who am now engaged in active warfare against one of its most implacable enemies.

But, gentlemen, for what purpose, let me ask, in all seriousness, has the learned gentleman entered into this room? I am come to prove that my Christianity is of the *primitive* stamp, and his of the *unprimitive*. Now he (my reverend friend) proves the unprimitiveness of his Christianity, by the very mode of arguing by which he would fain uphold it. Throw away, he cries out incessantly to me and my fellow-Catholics—throw away to the *bats and the moles* the superstitious tales of your nurseries; disencumber

your religion of your idle doctrines, your Invocation of Angels and Saints, your Purgatory, your Masses, your Transubstantiation! Such, my friends, is the logical battery by which my learned antagonist would endeavour to shake the rock of ages, on which I this day so proudly stand. But see, my friends, the consequence of such a strain of argument once admitted:—Disencumber your religion, your Scotch kirk, cries out the Unitarian with equal vehemence to my reverend antagonist, of its idolatrous adoration to a mere man, as if he were a God; and, Disencumber your religion, cries out the Deist to the Unitarian (as you have already made some advance to the altar of reason by rejecting the divinity of Christ) of all its lingering veneration to Christ Jesus as a man! save yourself, by living up to the laws of morality; rely not on the ideal efficacy of another man's suffering to atone for your delinquencies, or for those of your primeval ancestor, Adam! Lastly, comes down the Materialist, crying out to each and to all of us together—Christians of all denominations, disencumber your thoughts of all religious fears or hopes, of whatsoever shape or form they may be; let the enjoyment of this short, perishable life be the sole object of your care—your sole ambition; Nature is your God, let Nature be your guide. So, my friends, would a Hume or a Rousseau exclaim; and from the pages of a Rousseau it is, I am firmly persuaded, my learned friend has borrowed the lustre of those vainly-glittering diamonds of oratory with which his speeches abound, in counter-play to those which I use, ever invigorated as they are by the interposition of a solid body of argument.

My reverend friend looks aghast,

and yet if, since the beginning of this discussion, my learned antagonist would wish to see thrown, as it were, into a balance, the whole weight of his argumentation against the Catholic religion, he has nothing to do but to turn the eye of his mind to the weight of that argumentation used by the Unitarian against him, and by the Deist against the Unitarian, and by the Materialist against the Deist, and he will know how to estimate its exact value; yes, he will then see the weight of that gaudily-painted bubble that flies about this room, night after night, in the shape and mimicry of argument, and which is so greedily swallowed by the mouths of the fond, admiring, gaping auditors around him. For, verily speaking, Protestant friends, it is high time to inform you, that your minds are whirled around too rapidly by the torrent-pouring orator that opposes me, to find a resting-place for the pause of reason. Were the fervid wheel of my learned friend's imagination but condemned to move slowly—in plainer language, were he compelled to speak as I do, with slow and sober meditation, you would soon, very soon be made sensible, my friends, that no tempestuous current of oratory, how delightful soever to the ear may be its effusion, could atone for the harsh dissonance of illogical deduction.

Well, be this as it may, I am condemned, it seems, to follow the learned gentleman through all his wanderings. The Invocation of Angels and Saints is the question, and he now brings in the ponderous folios of the Bollandists to throw at my head, instead of argument. What have they, I ask, in the name of common sense, to do with this discussion? He cites them, but for what purpose? Why, solely with

this deep logical intendment — to persuade you, my friends, that if the Bollandists, in recording the lives of saints, were too credulous or fabulous in their narratives, *therefore*, all the Scripture which I have quoted in proof of that invocation falls to the ground as so many idle texts, totally annihilated in an instant. But, my friends, though I will not condescend to dwell on such puerility in debating, I will say this, and say it energetically—namely, that I would rather credulously swallow every tale recorded in that ponderously voluminous composition alluded to, namely, the lives of saints written by the Bollandists—nay, I tell him that I would rather be the most ignorant and illiterate old woman that ever believed in apparitions and ghosts, and, to complete the climax, in ranting speeches [laughter] of Scotch *improvisatores*, than I would assert with Calvin—impiously assert—as an article of my creed, in explaining that passage concerning the descent of our Blessed Saviour into the regions below, that he actually went into hell, and suffered *for awhile the pains of the damned!* [sensation.] There's shuddering blasphemy, my friends! This it is that renders harmless the superstitious dotage of old women and little children. Who can hear it, that has been brought up in the school of Christianity?—who can hear such a tremendous doctrine, without feeling a congealing horror in every part of his body? He then tells me of St. Paul. He cries out, Paul cannot help you—Peter cannot help you: it is God, it is Christ our Blessed Lord and Redeemer, that alone can help you! I say, again and again, What inconsistency is this! what a wandering from all logic is it to go on in this manner, time after time, when a standing doctrine of your own

Church admits the mediation of any man on earth, without interfering with the great mediation of Christ Jesus! It is illogical in the extreme to reproach the ROMAN CATHOLIC with adoring with any low servility the angels and saints. They are the means of purifying our minds, too much occupied by terrestrial things, and of directing them to the attainment of a loftier happiness than is ever to be enjoyed by man, whilst moving amid earthly things, and among scenes of pollution, where his eyes and his ears are defiled in this great capital—are defiled with blasphemy and roaring declamation against everything that is holy, and heavenly, and sublime. How absurd, my friends, is it to suppose that the prayers of living man may ascend to a throne of grace; and that the pure spirit, the moment that it has reached the regions of bliss, is simultaneously deprived of all power of interceding for friends and relatives below! as if there were to be no communion between men on earth and the inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem; as if it were something congenial to the feelings of human nature, that the moment the spirit is released, and, in its glorified state, receives a crown of glory, that it is to be insensible to the things of this world! [Sensation.]

Oh! my friends, how clearly does all this prove, what even Southey, the Protestant Poet Laureate and Wesleyan enthusiast, has himself asserted, that the Bible, read without the instruction of lawful pastors, may lead to error, as it may lead to truth! So says Southey, and so says his far greater, “the rock on whom the Church was built,” the immortal St. Peter, in reference to the works of St. Paul—“wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and

unstable wrest to their own damnation."

Now, my friends, I read in Scripture—(I will give you another little specimen of Scripture to-night)—I read in Matthew xviii. 10, that there are guardian angels; and, when I read this, I exclaim, Why should my learned friend, who is not more versed in sacred things than myself, and whose breast is not, I think, animated and glowing with a more fervent love for the blessed Redeemer than myself—why should he teach me to scorn this doctrine which Scripture teaches me, that we have guardian angels (as our Catechism tells us), and that it has been taught in every country from the days of the apostles? Why should I be ashamed when I go home to-night, and when I fall prostrate at the feet of my crucifix, where I see the image of my expiring Redeemer—why should I be ashamed, among my other prayers, to say—"Oh! blessed and holy angel guardian, watch over me, I beseech you, this night and all the days of my life, preserving me in all purity of thought, word, look, and deed, and defending me from all harm, both of soul and body, by thy holiest intercession. Amen."

Why, I say, should I be ashamed to offer a prayer of this nature, when I find that it, or something of a similar nature, has been offered from age to age from the time of the apostles in every part of the world, and especially those offered up to the Virgin Mary, in fulfilment of the grand prophecy, "*all generations shall call me blessed?*"

Now here, as I am about to quote a father, let not the learned gentleman exclaim, that I will not go to the Scriptures: let him at length be persuaded that my fathers *always come with the Bible in their hands*. St. Augustine says—"It is a proof

of a kind regard towards the dead, when their bodies are deposited near the monuments of saints. But hereby in what are they aided, unless in this, that, recollecting the place where they lie, we may be induced to recommend them to the patronage of those saints for their prayers to God? Calling, therefore, to mind the grave of a departed friend, and near the monument of the venerable martyr, we naturally commend the soul to his prayers. And that the souls of those will be thereby benefited who so lived as to deserve it, there can be no doubt."—*St. Aug. De Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda*, c. iv. t. vi. p. 519. Ed. Bened. Paris 1679. But they are our advocates, not by their own merits, but as members united to their head. He is truly the only Advocate, "who, sitting at the right hand of the Father, intercedes for us."—*Aug. de Civ. Dei*, lib. viii. c. 27.

Now, gentlemen, here the dispute ought to end. My friend ought not to insist on parleying for another evening on this subject; this ought really to terminate it, because it is not in the power of all the subtlety and casuistry of the learned gentleman, and all his metaphorical eloquence, which he has so inexhaustibly at command, to give any other possible doctrine on Catholic antiquity than that given by him, namely, St. Augustine, whom *Calvin* declares to be its trustiest preserver and most uncorrupt expounder.

Again, What means, I ask my friend, the passage I quoted from *Zachariah*? Is there not contained in it a most ardent prayer, full of tenderness and commiseration for Jerusalem? "Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem?" &c. If the learned gentleman, in his pathetic

strain and melodious voice, were to turn to me and to exclaim, "Oh, dear fellow-Christian! Oh, dear Roman Catholic! how long wilt thou not listen to the kind advice of thy fellow-Protestant, and enter within their comfortable harbours, where thy soul is sure to be saved?" should I be wrong in asserting that my friend made a tender entreaty to me, that I would come over to his Church? The words could admit of no other meaning—he would be praying to me to come over to his Church and embrace his baleful, his dismally soul-ruining tenets. And here let me ask my Bible-read, my Bible-steeped antagonist, when Christ says to me, to "take heed lest I scandalize one of these little ones, *for that their angels do always behold the face of his Father which is in heaven*"—am I to listen to Christ telling me that they have guardian angels, or to the Reverend Mr. Cumming, telling me that they have none? I would ask also, Is this text from the fathers? Is this from St. Ignatius? Is this from Irenæus? Is this from Justyn Martyr?

Again, if I were to ask my learned friend, who is not only a combatant for his own Calvinistic doctrines, but a combatant also, engaged by a most extraordinary commission, in fighting the battles of the Church of England, and of the Baptists, and of the Wesleyan Methodists, and, for aught I know, of the *Welsh Jumpers* [laughter]—if I were to ask him to explain that prayer in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England—"O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order, mercifully grant, that as thy holy angels always do thee service in heaven, so by thy appointment they may succour and defend us on earth, through Jesus Christ our

Lord"—would he arise and say, that the only ground on which to account for it was, by his favourite subterfuge, a little "orientalism," just as by an *ex post facto* argument the other evening, he wanted Dr. Watts's Hymns to act upon the pages of the fathers? [laughter]—the pages of Dr. Watts, who was known to cherish the vilest antipathy for the Catholics, and spoke against them on all occasions most virulently, and even in the introduction to his *Logic*, in the very preface, as well as in other parts of the work. And it is, forsooth, this wiseacre, this see-saw hymn-maker, Isaac Watts, who, in his contemptible jargon, called by my learned friend *beautiful poetry*, is, by his using the words, "This is my real body, my real blood," &c., which every one knows, from the life and writings of Isaac Watts, he uses figuratively—that is made by the consequential reasoning of my learned antagonist to act upon the pages of the fathers. Yes, this Isaac Watts is to make them who were never known by their lives or writings to gainsay that doctrine; but, on the contrary, were ever known to declare solemnly and unanimously, that they meant *reality*, not figure—he is to make them, I say, by this *ex post facto* species of argumentation, all sound Protestants! Wonderful magic-working logician! His reasoning runs thus:—"If Isaac Watts, in his hymns, using the words, 'This is my real body and my real blood,' still is known to you all to mean it figuratively; *therefore* it follows by all the laws of just reason, that when Christ uttered the words, *This is my body, this is my blood*, Christ must have meant it figuratively." It follows, as a matter of course, according to my learned co-reasoner, that the best commentary on the words of our Lord and Saviour, in

his last testament, must be the meaning which Isaac Watts attaches to similar words used by him, in his poetical legacy to his Protestant brethren, called hymns.

Such was the beautiful specimen of the learned gentleman's *ex post facto* logic. But, gentlemen, that is not the mode of argument in which to proceed, or the mode in which I intend to proceed. Let me give one fair and honourable advice to my learned friend before we part this evening—not to let the decision of this mighty case depend upon tropes or metaphors, or the wildness of declamation; let it depend on solid reasoning, on learned investigation. Let us, on Thursday next, if he thinks proper, keep the fathers out of the question; let us come to the Bible; let us come to the New Testament; and let us fight the battle there. Let him leave my saints alone, and I will leave his Calvinistic venerated overturners-of-altars alone, as well as those, his late predecessors in bigotry, who attempted to deluge the streets of London with blood, in their fanatical fury, some years ago, and by whose sanguinary hands, had it not been for my guardian angel, I had fallen a sacrifice in the days of my infancy. Let us abandon, I say, all recrimination on both sides.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Hear! hear!

Mr. FRENCH—[in continuation.] Let us argue like men and soldiers for the truth—for the truth, and for the truth alone. I own I have a desire of doing away with the old prejudice that subsists in this country against the religion of my ancestors. I have studied that religion deeply and laboriously, and I know that those who come to embrace it will be saved to all holiness; that they will become more and more enamoured, every day they live, of

our blessed and immortal Redeemer—that all-meeek Redeemer, I say, who is so much on my friend's tongue, even when he is pouring forth a torrent of virulent invective against his Catholic neighbour. This is not the way to open to us a pathway to heaven. I tell him so, because he literally compels me to retort his insulting language. I do it, not for the sake of discharging my heart of any rancour harboured there against him, but to show that it is just as easy for one man to reply, as it is for him to utter hard unpalatable things. Let us cease to use language of this kind, and throw away every trifling, extraneous argument. On Thursday let us argue fairly and act honourably. I will fight the battles of the Catholic, and he may fight in the cause of Calvin. Let us both seek with earnestness for that inestimable jewel, truth; and after we shall have listened to the voice of ages, telling us where it is to be found, communicate respectively to the same audience the fruit of our investigations.

Gentlemen, I shall only add, that from these concurrent testimonies of texts from the Bible, and extracts from the holy fathers of the Church, every Protestant that considers them impartially must, by this time, be convinced that this doctrine of ages, this *Intercession of Angels and Saints*, is not to be invalidated by the puny theologians of the nineteenth century, however potent they may be in all the delusive tricks of oratory, and however skilful they may be in drawing your minds away into remote digressions, far from the field of argument. The priests, you may see, of the Catholic Church have firmer props than falsehood and cunning to support their tenets, although their adversaries cannot impose upon their flocks by any

other artifice than that every-day one with which they have the unhal-
lowed daring to upbraid the Catholic
priesthood, namely, that of keeping
the people in profound ignorance as
to the tenets of primitive Christi-
anity. No: the priests of the Ca-
tholic Church have no reason to
make it the study of their lives to
seek with acuteness how to evade
the pages of the fathers, or to
subtilize and refine upon them; the
language which they speak is in
exact consonance with the declara-
tion of the primitive Church, and
with the uniform practice of that
same descending Church, now for
nearly nineteen centuries, in every
region of the Christianized world.
To those whose churches are built
upon adverse principles, artifice is
as necessary to give those principles
plausibility, as is their daily food for
the support of their animal exist-
ence. Yes, it is necessary for mi-
nisters like these to smother the
testimonies of the fathers, which
otherwise would cry out with such
irresistible evidence against their
new-fangled doctrines. They have
no resource left but to persuade
their congregations that the doc-
trine of Invoking Angels and
Saints, instead of having taken root
in the apostolic age, and flourished
with unfading verdure from that era
down to the present period, is a
scion of superstition that sprouted

up in the land of Christianity in one
of the dark ages!

Gentlemen, I have a few mo-
ments more, but I have exhausted
my argument, at least I have ex-
hausted myself. I wish, on the
following evening, that my learned
friend will come animated into this
room with more of the gentle spirit
of Christianity.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Hear! hear!

Mr. FRENCH.—And I promise
him that he shall not have to re-
proach me with wandering from the
argument or the pages of the Bible.
To that line of conduct I should
wish the reverend gentleman's assent
before we part [turning to the Rev.
J. Cumming, who misunderstood the
allusion].

Rev. J. CUMMING [rising].—I
would most distinctly declare that
I wish all kind of personality should
cease—[the reverend gentleman
was here interrupted, some persons
fearing that he was about to enter
on a speech. The reverend gentle-
man continued.]—I am not going to
make a speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. FRENCH.—I do not accuse
you of personality. In every res-
pect the learned gentleman is a man
of the most conspicuous talent that
can be found; I only wish that he
was more of my texture of mind,
and my way of thinking. [Laughter].

[The learned gentleman's hour
here terminated.]

SIXTH EVENING, THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1839.

SUBJECT:

INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND ANGELS.

(Continued.)

Rev. J. CUMMING.—On the last occasion on which you were ad-
dressed from this spot by my learned antagonist, Mr. French, you may
recollect that he indulged in what I
pronounce to be a very uncalled-for

and gratuitous description of the mode which I had pursued in laying open the errors (and their results) of the Roman Catholic Church upon the one hand, and in confuting those errors from the word of God, and showing up the contradictory nature of the statements of the fathers on the other hand. Now I am most anxious to disabuse the mind of Mr. French, and of every Roman Catholic in this assembly, of any impression leading them to suppose that I cherish one atom of hostile or bitter feeling toward the humblest or the highest individual in the room. I can, most honestly and conscientiously, as in the sight of the great Searcher of Hearts, say, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for them is, that they may be saved;" but, seeing them going about to reject the righteousness of Christ, and to establish the righteousness of the creature, I feel it my sacred duty, and my sweetest privilege, to warn them against the error of their way. Let me also add, I own, notwithstanding the love I bear to every individual, I cherish—and I should not be honest if I did not say so—I cherish the intensest antipathy to the system of which they are the unhappy and perishing victims. I believe that system—and Mr. French knows that this was my impression at the outset)—I believe that system to be dishonourable to God; I believe it to be dangerous to your precious souls; and I do feel that I display my love to you most strongly, when I refute and reprobate the system you cling to most decidedly. I know it will give pain to some sensitive feelings, and startle many a mind long accustomed to revere the system as sacred and apostolical. I know it must have given pain to my learned antagonist, to have been obliged to hear exposed the system he

has been trained to in all the breadth of its corruption, and in all its native deformity in which it is represented, though diluted as it is recognised in Rome's accredited documents; but then I feel that the exhibition of the unscriptural and unprimitive character of the system is the very way to emancipate those who are its victims.

On this subject I am reminded of an incident recorded to have taken place when the dome of St. Paul's cathedral was being painted, in London. It is stated, that the celebrated painter, who had erected a scaffold in the interior of the dome, had sketched some exquisite designs and paintings upon the wall; and the scaffolding having no outside railing to defend him, he was walking backwards, admiring and contemplating the proportions and perspective of the work he had just executed. He kept walking backward and backward, until his heels trembled on the very verge of the scaffold, from which another step would have precipitated him to a depth of some two hundred feet, and left him a mangled corpse on the floor below. A friend who was on the scaffold, seeing the awful jeopardy in which the painter was placed, and knowing that if he had called out he would probably have taken another step further, and have thus been dashed to pieces, and feeling his danger, rushed forward and threw a large pot of paint upon the exquisite work which he had painted on the wall. Immediately the painter, anxious for the safety of his work, rushed forward to save the painting from the threatened destruction, and thereby learned, in life, the wisdom of his friend. Now this is just an illustration of my course with Mr. French and the Roman Catholics before me. I know it will grieve you while I destroy

the bright, the glittering, the fascinating visions by which you are so captivated and charmed; but then I know that the only way of saving your souls is to blast, by fair means, and by just, and open, and legitimate reasoning, that dark, apostate system (for I must still speak honestly, as I have done throughout) of which you are the prey. In God's sight, this may be your great guilt—I say, in God's sight, your error may be your great guilt; but in my sight it is your deep and your painful misfortune. I regard it as your misfortune—God alone can regard it as your guilt. *I*, feeling it to be your misfortune, should act a most unchristian part, if I did not say throughout, that my prayerful and heartfelt desire is, that the system may be unceasingly detested and ultimately abjured, and that those who have been beguiled by the cup of its enchantment may be brought to sink every other name in comparison, and to behold exclusively the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. And, therefore, I hope I have indulged (you can all bear me witness) in no virulent or vituperative invective; I have scrupulously avoided it. I have spoken courteously but plainly; I never felt that my antagonist had treated me with bitterness or virulence, till, no doubt from the failure of all argument and of all logic, last night, when I think (unhappily for the impression made upon the audience) he, for a moment, forgot the courtesies of Christian conduct. I know and hope he will be the first to correct himself for having used any expressions calculated to disturb the harmony which has hitherto prevailed in canvassing this vital and most important question.

Let me observe, in the next place, that I find, in my notes, that, in making some extracts from the

celebrated writings of the Bollandists, I was called to order, as quoting a work not authorized or recognised in the Church of Rome. I candidly admit that it does not bear the seal and stamp of actual infallibility, or Roman Catholic inerrability; but when I wished to illustrate my assertion, that the doctrine under review had led to most superstitious results, and to bring before you specimens of the superstitions to which the Invocation of Saints had naturally led, I did not have recourse to any paltry work that I had taken from some hole or corner, and which might have contained sentiments and expressions not warranted or recognised by the Church of Rome; but I went to what the celebrated Leibnitz (as quoted by Charles Butler, the distinguished advocate of the Church of Rome) has declared to be "the most splendid work of the Jesuits." I went to the eighty large folios, containing the lives of the saints, collected by the Jesuits, the most learned body of the Church of Rome, and all of which are composed by recognised doctors and members of the Roman Catholic communion. I took these eighty large folios, which Mr. French knows to be pure Romanism. That cannot be a hole-and-corner production; these cannot be a paltry performance collected and composed by an unknown Jesuit. These eighty folios are quoted, with marked approbation, by Charles Butler, Esq.

Now, observe, this is the favourable verdict of the learned Leibnitz on these works of the Jesuits to which I have referred—a verdict, you observe, not concealed or disclaimed, but brought forward, openly gloried in, and prominently displayed by a distinguished advocate of the Church of Rome, Charles Butler, Esq. Therefore, in quoting from

these works, I quoted from one of the most important, one of the most voluminous, and one of the best known productions of that most distinguished order in the Church of Rome; and I do think that if the quotations I made on miracles, on the acts of saints, the appearances of Satan, and all the absurd and wretched legendary lore which it contains, if they hurt the feelings of any Roman Catholic before me, then I pray you, visit the Jesuits—visit *them* with your withering contempt—with your indignation, and renounce the Church that sanctions them. I hold it to be a most extraordinary fact, that the Church of Rome, being in the habit of adding her *imprimatur* sanction and approval, through appointed agents, to every book that might be profitably read—and if she found any passage in that book against the Church, having it in her power to cancel those passages, or of refusing to permit the book to be circulated, never condemned the Bollandists—I do say, that if the Church of Rome, by her appointed and accredited authorities and censors, suffered such a book to be recognised, and to be signed and circulated, and yet repressed and withheld many nobler and glorious monuments of human genius and learning—I do feel that I am guilty of no unfair imputation when I father on the Church of Rome the responsibility of those eighty folio volumes.

At the close of his speech my learned antagonist quoted Doctors Montague and Thorndyke, who had at a previous period been bishops of the Church of England, and who, it appears, had said that the Invocation of Saints does not amount to idolatry. My simple reply to this is just what Mr. French returned to me when I quoted Mr. Nolan: they are “a couple of weeds,” which I

cast with the greatest satisfaction into his garden. And, therefore, if he finds that the sentiments of these men, who wore Protestant surplices and subscribed to Protestant articles, and were in the habit of saying Protestant prayers, were popish—if these men chose to hoist false colours—in other words, if they belonged to the Church of Rome, whilst they derived their emoluments from the Protestant Church, then let not the Protestant Church be saddled with their sentiments; for her articles, her homilies, and creeds, repudiate and reject them.

Mr. French, in the next portion of his speech, quoted one, I think, of the most sweet and beautiful hymns, addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ, that I have heard for many a day. It was a hymn that does credit to the poetic genius of my antagonist, and that shows he is a poet of no mean order, and that he has some devotion to his Lord Jesus, which I pray may be so fostered and fanned by the Holy Spirit of God, that his devotion to Jesus may absorb and consume all his devotion for Mary and for saints. His hymn, I say, was exceedingly scriptural and exceedingly beautiful; and when I draw up (as I intend to do, one day) a collection of hymns, I mean to write to Mr. French and request that beautiful and scriptural hymn, and I have no doubt that he will give it me with the greatest pleasure. But having heard Mr. French’s “private” hymn, it is important, I think, that you should lay it side by side with some other hymns that are possessed of far greater authority, and are in more extensive circulation in the Church of Rome. You have heard an *individual’s* hymn; now I wish to let you hear a hymn with *episcopal* sanction, taken from the “Garden of the Soul. A new and amended edition, by lawful au-

thority," bearing the *imprimatur* of Dr. Walsh, Roman Catholic bishop of the midland district. He says, "The present edition of the Garden of the Soul receives my cordial approbation, and is recommended by me to the general use of the clergy and laity. ✠ THOS. WALSH."

A HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

Hail, thou resplendent star,
Which shinest o'er the main,
Blest Mother of our God,
And ever Virgin Queen.

Hail, happy gate of bliss,
Greeted by Gabriel's tongue,
Negotiate our peace ! !
And cancel Eva's wrong ! !

Loosen the sinner's bands ;
And evils drive away ;
Bring light unto the blind,
And for all graces pray.—Page 312.

Now you have heard Mr. French's beautiful and scriptural hymn to Christ, and also another from the formularies of his Church. I reject private interpretations and poetical effusions. I must deal fairly, and have recourse to authorized documents. My opponent's effusion is good—that of his Church is rank idolatry. His Church is infallible; he is fallible. Again I quote, from the same document, a portion of the Litany of our Lady at Loretto, which is recommended by the same Roman Catholic bishop to every one in his diocese. It begins first with a prayer to God, a prayer to Christ, a prayer to the Holy Spirit, to have mercy upon us; and then it calls on Mary, "*Pray for us.*" But what I wish to call your attention to are the attributes and titles of Mary.

Holy *Mary*,
Holy Mother of God,
Holy Virgin of Virgins,
Mother of *Christ*,
Mother of divine grace,
Mother most pure,
Mother most chaste,
Mother undefiled,

Mother untouched,
Mother most amiable,
Mother most admirable,
Mother of our Creator,
Mother of our Redeemer,
Virgin most prudent,
Virgin most venerable,
Virgin most renowned,
Virgin most powerful,
Virgin most merciful,
Virgin most faithful,
Mirror of justice,
Seat of wisdom,
Cause of our joy,
Spiritual vessel,
Vessel of honour,
Vessel of singular devotion,
Mystical rose,
Tower of *David*,
Tower of ivory,
House of gold,
Ark of the covenant,
Gate of heaven,
Morning star,
Health of the weak,
Refuge of sinners,
Comforter of the afflicted,
Help of Christians,
Queen of angels,
Queen of patriarchs,
Queen of prophets,
Queen of apostles,
Queen of martyrs,
Queen of confessors,
Queen of virgins,
Queen of all saints.

In this long string the choicest epithets which the Holy Ghost applies to Christ are dishonestly filehed and applied to a creature, Mary. She is the "*Morning Star!*" What an awful falsehood! Christ hath said, "*I am the bright and the Morning Star;*" the Church of Rome says, Mary is "*the health of the weak, the refuge of sinners.*" But in the sacred Scriptures, and in the forty-sixth Psalm, God is described as "*the refuge for sinners;*" but here Mary is said to be "*the refuge for sinners.*" She is described not only

as "Queen of Heaven," but "the comforter of the afflicted." But our blessed Lord declares, "I will send you *another Comforter*, even the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, who shall abide with you for ever." And in this collection there is one prayer to be offered to Mary the most awful I ever read. I am sorry to be obliged to read these; but though they are of so awful a nature, I feel it is my bounden duty to show the tendency of that article of your creed which says, that saints are to be venerated. I wish to show you plainly what your Church is made up of; and however beautiful it may appear when told by a silver-tongued defender of his Church, the practical effects of the theory are of a very different stamp.

"We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but obtain our deliverance from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin.

"Pray for us, O holy Mother of God.

"That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ."

Gard. of Soul, p. 379.

"PRAYER.

"Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that we thy servants may enjoy health of mind and body; and that by the intercession of the ever Blessed Virgin, all thy saints likewise interceding for us, we may be delivered from present sorrow, and hereafter enjoy eternal happiness. Amen."—*Ibid.*

I now leave the volume itself, having made these few extracts illustrative of its principles and character. Now you have heard Mr. French's beautiful scriptural poem, and you have now heard the poems of his Church, invested with far greater authority. I ask, Which is the correct exhibition of the Roman

Catholic faith? The two cannot coalesce. If an effort be made to amalgamate the two, then the result will take place which my friend is acquainted with from his classical reading, as stated by Horace in his "Art of Poetry:—"

"Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Jungere si velit, et varias inducere plumas
Undique collatis membris, ut turpiter
atrum
Desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne;
Spectatum admissi, lacrymas teneatis,
amici?"

If my opponent holds nothing *additional* to his poem, he will be left in purgatory, and it in the *Index Prohibitorius*.

The next remark in the closing speech of my learned antagonist was, How can Mr. Cumming presume to stint the omnipotence of God, especially as applicable to saints in heaven hearing the prayers of those who are on earth? He said, "May not God give power to the saints who are in heaven to hear and receive prayers offered upon earth?" Now I am no judge of what God *might* do; the rule of my faith is not the omnipotence of God, but the *written word* of God. The question, you observe, is not what attributes God might be pleased to endue saints in heaven withal; but the question is, In what position has he placed saints that are in heaven, with reference to their hearing those prayers that may be offered up by those on earth? Now, when I refer to the book which is my rule of faith, and which, I believe, is part of the rule of faith of my learned antagonist, I find every disproof of saints on earth being authorized to pray to those who are in glory. If the Bible declare the doctrine untrue, we have no right to ask whether it could have been otherwise. For instance, in Ecclesiastes ix. 5, 6,

"For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." My friend asks how saints in heaven can hear the prayers lifted up to them on earth? My answer is, they cannot, because "they have not any more a portion in any thing that is done under the sun." I quote another illustration from Scripture of the impossibility of saints in heaven (as far as it is revealed to us) hearing prayers offered up to them from those on earth. (2 Kings ii. 9.) And it came to pass, when they were gone over (the river), that Elijah said unto Elisha, "Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee;" implying that if Elisha wished to possess any benefit or any kind token from Elijah, he must do it before Elijah was taken away from him; and that very statement implies that Elijah in heaven could do nothing for Elisha on earth. I will give you another proof of the same great fact. In the second of Kings, xxii. 20: "Behold, therefore, I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil that I will bring upon this place;" another intimation, you observe, that Josiah in heaven should not "see the evil that God would bring on that place." Again, Isaiah lxiii. 16: "Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer; thy name is from everlasting." Here it is stated that Abraham is ignorant of those he left on earth, and that

Israel, or Jacob, in heaven, has no intercourse with the children of Israel that were left on earth.

The next remark I have to make was in reference to my learned antagonist's treatment of Dr. Delahogue, and I really must congratulate my learned friend on the rapid progress he is making. We have induced him, you recollect, to throw Aquinas overboard, and to disclaim all sympathy with his sentiments. After this we got him to give Augustine one of the most mortal wounds he has ever received from his great patron and friend, my learned and accomplished antagonist; for he very candidly and ingeniously stated, "Well, if St. Augustine said so and so, I beg to differ from St. Augustine." So much for his treatment of the glorious St. Augustine. Then we got him to cast overboard—whom do you think? The learned and illustrious Delahogue, who has written five volumes on Roman Catholic Theology, and who was the teacher in Maynooth of a whole generation of Roman Catholic Irish priests, and who refer to his works (mind you) as guides and as depositaries of Christian knowledge and Christian truth; yet the Professor of Maynooth, that learned and accomplished author, the able Dr. Delahogue—my learned friend tells me that he is not of any authority, and overboard he goes also. [Laughter.] Now I just wish my friend to take one step further, and to cast the whole fabric of superstition overboard after them, and bid a final *vale!* to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Invocation of Saints.

In reference to the distinctions of *Latria* and *Doulia*, I quote Scripture to show that it does not recognise a distinction between any two such words. And while I admit in the fullest manner, that the Roman Catholic Church does make an arbi-

trary distinction between *Latria* (which is the worship to be given to God) and *Doulia* (the worship to be given to saints) and *Hyper-doulia*, or worship to be given to the Virgin Mary; yet I hold that no such distinction exists in Scripture. I admitted that the Roman Catholic Church preserved the distinction in *theory*—it is quite another question whether it be also observed in her practice.

The next argument brought forward by my antagonist, was from the Gospel of St. Luke, xv. 6, quoting from the tenth verse: "And likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Now, observe you, while I do not disclaim my belief in the tenet that angels rejoice over repentant sinners, yet I maintain that the only way angels know it, is by receiving information to that effect. At all events, whatever be the views you hold as to angels as "ministering spirits," or "angels rejoicing in heaven," this passage, I contend, gives not the least ground for believing that the angels themselves do actually, from personal knowledge, sympathize with converted sinners upon earth. I will refer to the passage. You observe, the picture is that of a shepherd who, having lost one of his hundred sheep, leaves the ninety-and-nine and goes after the one which is lost; and when he comes home, he is here represented as calling together his friends, and *telling* them he has found the sheep that was lost, and bidding them rejoice: "So there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth;" that is, according to the parallel, God *announces* to angels that a sinner is converted, and bids them rejoice. The other emblem employed in the chapter, is that of

a woman who lost a piece of money. She is represented as going in search for it with a candle, sweeping the house until she finds it. She then *bids* her neighbours rejoice; so "there is joy in the presence of God over one sinner that repenteth." The passage implying, that just as this woman calls together her friends, proclaims to them the news, and bids them rejoice; so, at God's command, the tidings that a sinner is converted, circulate and thrill through the realms of the redeemed, and angels are bidden to rejoice. And the father of the prodigal son, when the prodigal has arisen from the husks that he was eating, and is received again into his father's bosom and his father's home, the father calls his family and his friends together, and *bids* them rejoice, because his son "was lost and is found." The three parables prove that angels *learn* from God what occurs on earth. And, moreover, you observe, even if this were not the parallel, is there one particle of precedent or Scripture reason for praying either to angels or saints, in this chapter? Angels in heaven rejoicing over the redeemed on earth is one thing, but saints or sinners on earth praying to angels in heaven is a totally opposite thing; and it will be indeed a most extraordinary specimen of that logic, about which my learned friend has been so prosy and garrulous, and for which he has been so anxious, if he can show that the one necessarily or at all establishes the other.

The next passage he quoted was Matthew xviii. 10, where it is said of children, "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." Now, that is the simple, unvarnished statement, namely, that angels do always behold the face of the Father of these chil-

dren in heaven. Does the passage breathe one syllable about the worshipping of angels? Does it give one precedent for the Invocating of Saints? By what sort of extraordinary alchymy will my learned friend extract the Invocation of Saints from the simple historical statement of Scripture, that angels in heaven behold the face of the Father of these children on earth? I cannot see that such a quotation has anything to do with the subject.

The next passage quoted was Zachariah i. 8, where it is said, "Zachariah beheld an angel among the myrtle-trees." Now, in the first place, I would observe, this angel is distinctly shown by parallel references, and by the reading of the whole context, to be the Lord Jesus Christ, Jehovah, the Angel, the Lord of Hosts. The same angel that appeared to Moses, as recorded in Exodus, that appeared to Manoa, to Jacob, and to other saints throughout the Old-Testament Scripture. And in the next place, the prophet was standing on the earth, and the angel on the earth also. "And the angel (it is added) spoke comfortable words unto him." But, observe, my antagonist must not perplex and mystify the real question; it is not whether one saint may say to another *on the earth*, "Pray for me,"—for that is most scriptural and right, and I trust you have obeyed the injunction I gave you to pray for Mr. French, that his mind may be enlightened with "the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus;" but mark you, this is a totally different question—whether you are to pray to saints and angels *in heaven*. God forbid that I should ever preach such a theology as that, in the face of the clearest announcements of inspiration to the contrary.

The next passage he quoted was from Job, and in reference to one saint speaking to another. Now, the language here also is evidently applicable to saints on earth; but you will recollect I stated, at the outset of my remarks last night, that as regards the Old Testament, my friend will be most effective when he is most silent, because he knows that the sentiment of his Church is, that the saints of the Old Testament were *in limbo*; that no prayers could be offered to saints under the Old-Testament dispensation; they could not help themselves out of limbo, much less others; and therefore, on the very passage which he has had the daring to quote to-night from the Old-Testament, he must recollect that his mouth is shut by his Church, and that he dare not quote an Old-Testament text for a proof of this.

There is one instance of a prayer to saints in the word of God, and there is just one. But it is one of the most disastrous precedents for Roman Catholics that can be quoted. It is that of the rich man in hell, who prayed to Abraham in heaven to give him a drop of water to cool the tip of his tongue. Now, was it answered? No, my friends, there was no answer in return. The case indeed is not exactly parallel, because he was in hell and we are on earth. But an instance and illustration of a sinner praying to a saint in glory, is that of the rich man in hell praying to Abraham in heaven, and receiving a negative to his petition. Poor encouragement for every Roman Catholic! Poor precedent, my friends, to risk the possibility of idolatry on! Poor and paltry ground for addressing (I will speak honestly and plainly) what I believe to be blasphemous prayers to the Virgin Mary and to saints, some of whom were the greatest

rogues on earth and now the tenants of Pandemonium. I stated last evening that I should confine my remarks especially to the *Hyper-doulia* or inferior worship given to the Virgin Mary; for it is to be remembered that the Roman Church gives *Doulia* to the saints of God, and what they call *Hyper-doulia* to the Virgin Mary; that is, a worship much greater than *Doulia* and not so great as *Latria*. The Romish doctors split hairs with the most exquisite skill. But the terrible result of it is, that the poor Roman Catholic who is not able to divide hairs with such mathematical precision may be plunging into fearful idolatry, leaving the fountains of living water, and drinking from broken cisterns that can hold no water. I hold in my hand a document, well known to every Roman Catholic in this room, called the Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary. The title is as follows:—

"The Devotion and Office of the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ; with its Nature, Origin, and Progress, including the Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Mary. Twelfth Edition, with an Appendix and the Indult of his Holiness, Pope Pius, in favour of it. For the Use of the Midland District. Keating and Brown."

After the Missal there is no book of greater authority among English Romanists. The book, I may observe, may be found at London, and is now being reprinted at Duke-street. I read from this book, Section I. :—

"As the adorable heart of Jesus was formed in the chaste womb of the Blessed Virgin, and of her blood and substance, so we cannot in a more proper and agreeable manner show our devotion to the sacred heart of the Son than by

dedicating some part of the sacred devotion to the ever pure heart of the Mother.

"Go then, devout client, to the heart of Jesus, *but let your way be through the heart of Mary.*"

"This form and method of worship is the doctrine and the very spirit of God's Church: it is what she teaches us in the unanimous voice and practice of the faithful, who will by no means that Jesus and Mary should be separated from each other in our prayers, praises, and affections."

If you are indignant at the language that I quote here, you must vent that indignation against the Church which has misled you, and not against the faithful friend who would warn you of the precipice towards which you are approaching.

"Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be, come and behold. Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. *Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost!!!* fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate!"

This is downright blasphemy, and yet it is the doctrine of Rome.

Now, the next sentence is fearful; it is equally blasphemous. It is to the effect:—

"Hail Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to whom all power has been given both in heaven and earth." p. 205.

"Rejoice, O most glorious Virgin, such is thy favour with God, such the power of thy intercession, that the whole treasury of heaven is open to thee and at thy disposal. When thou art pleased to intercede in favour of a sinner, his case is in sure hands: there is no danger

of refusal on the part of Heaven when thy mediation appears in his behalf." p. 256.

"You are THE GREAT MEDIATRIX BETWEEN GOD AND MAN, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the Blessed Trinity."

Such are the fruits of this doctrine; such the rank idolatry imposed on you in the injured name of God and Christianity.

These are not all the specimens of these devotions of the Church in reference to the worship of the Virgin Mary! I hold in my hand also another document, a portion of which I have been reading, and a portion of which I have probably read to this audience on a former occasion. It is called the GLORIES OF MARY, MOTHER OF GOD. It is dedicated to Mary, ever a Virgin, and translated by a Roman Catholic priest. The dedication to the third edition is—

"To Mary ever Virgin; the most humble and most exalted of all pure creatures, the Queen of Angels and of Men; the Mother of God! of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Chirst, who shall be styled Blessed by all generations; who destroys all heresies throughout the world, and through whose powerful intercession the sacred deposit of faith once delivered to the saints has always been preserved in suffering Ireland. This volume, designed to increase the number and fervour of her clients in this island, is with all veneration and respect, most humbly dedicated by the most unworthy of her servants, the Translator."

Its authority is decisive, as its following prefatory remarks evince:—The work from which I take the extracts were examined by infallibility and proclaimed faultless. It

is, therefore, not the views of St. Liguori, but of his Church:—

"The holy father himself, in his brief for commencing the proceedings, said that he loved Liguori during his life, and remarked in him the most extraordinary piety and devotion.

"The *Sacred Congregation of Rites* having made the most rigorous examination of the writings of the saint, to the number of a hundred or more, pronounced that there was *nothing in them deserving of censure*, and this sentence was approved by Pius VII. in 1803.

"His successor, Leo XII., accompanied his brief to the editor of the works of the blessed Liguori, by a golden medal. To this examination succeeded that of the virtues of Liguori: the goodness of the cause appeared at once so evident, that the *Pope dispensed with the decree of Urban VIII. which forbade this special scrutiny to be made until after the expiration of fifty years from the death of the person in question.* The cardinals were UNANIMOUS (a thing very uncommon) that the virtues of the deceased had attained the heroic decree, which the Pope confirmed by his solemn decree of the 7th of May, 1807.

"The process of his *beatification* specifies that more than a hundred miracles were performed by the saints during his life! and twenty-eight after death. The brief declaring him blessed, dated September 6th, 1816, authorized the celebration of a mass in his honour, for which the Pope prescribed suitable prayers every year in the dioceses of Nocera and St. Agatha. In consequence of numerous solicitations, his holiness was induced, on the 28th of February, 1818, to sign the decree, which introduced the cause of this blessed man for canonization. At length, the decree

of his canonization was published by his late holiness, Pope Pius VIII. on the 16th of May, 1830."

Of Liguori, the author of the following idolatries, it is said in this preface:—

" 'That which most of all contributed to preserve his innocence,' says the author of 'Reflections on the Doctrine and Sanctity of the Blessed Liguori,' *'was his tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, to whom he was especially consecrated. Replenished with love for and confidence in Mary, he addressed himself to her in all his wants, and felt quite assured of obtaining all he asked through her intercession.'* This Blessed Virgin, whose praises he was never weary of recounting in the pulpit and in his writings, loaded him with the most signal favours. She often appeared to him in his most tender infancy, and deigned to become his instructor."

I maintain, that if the Pope had canonized the worshippers of Jupiter and Juno, he had sanctioned no greater idolaters than Liguori, whose life was spent, not in preaching Christ and glorying in the cross, but in worshipping and praising Mary.

I read you one or two extracts and prayers from this volume:—

"During the pontificate of St. Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly, that they had not time to make the least preparation. *It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy Pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God.* Having commanded the clergy and people to go in general procession to

the church of our Lady, called *St. Mary Major*, carrying the picture of the Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced; in every street as they passed, the plague ceased, and, before the end of the procession, an angel in human form was seen on the tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment, the angels were heard singing the anthem, 'Regina celi, &c. Triumph O Queen, and Alleluia.' The holy Pope added the words, 'Ora pro nobis Deum!' 'Petition God our souls to save!' The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time."

Again: "O Mary, my most amiable Mother! how is it that I your child so little resemble you? You so perfect, and I so perverse—you all inflamed with divine love, and I wholly alive to creatures—you so rich in grace, and I so poor in virtue. Oh how unworthy I am of my Mother! but do not forbid me to call you Mother, in punishment of my ingratitude: this amiable title consoles me, it redoubles my tenderness for you, animates my confidence in you, and reminds me of my obligation to love you. May I then invoke you during life, and die when calling on Mary my Mother, my blessed, amiable Mother!"

Again: "O Mother of my God! you whom the Church styles the refuge of sinners, behold me at your feet imploring your compassion; be moved at my miseries, I conjure you by the inestimable price of our redemption, and in the name of all it has cost your Son to rescue us from the captivity of the devil."

Again: "O Holy Virgin! deign to manifest your generosity towards me a miserable sinner. If you grant

me your aid, what can I fear? No, I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son, justly irritated, since one word from you will appease him. I shall only fear myself, and that, forgetting to invoke you, I may be lost. But this will not be the case. I promise you to-day to recur to you in all my wants, and that, during life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul. Amen."

Again: "O my tender Mother! what shall be the end of the miserable sinner that is before you! When I think of the terrible moment at which I shall have to render to God an account of my conduct, and when I remember how often I have, by my sins, written the sentence of my own condemnation, fear penetrates my bowels, and dries up the very marrow of my bones. O consolation of the afflicted! have pity on me: remorse of conscience gnaws me, my best actions are but imperfectly performed—hell awaits to carry off my soul—divine justice must be satisfied—what then shall become of me? what shall be my eternal lot? *Alas! without you I am lost: obtain for me a true sorrow for my sins, grace to amend and persevere during life; but, above all, in the agonies of death.* Mary, my hope, henceforth more than ever, do not abandon me, but support my confidence, lest I fall into despair. Amen."

"O purest of Virgins! I venerate your most holy heart, which is the delight of the Lord, the sanctuary of purity and humility, the abode of divine love. My heart which I present to you is of clay; sin has therein made most dreadful wounds—Mother of mercy, cure it, sanctify it, refuse not your pity to

him whom Jesus has not refused his blood."

Again: "It is impossible that a true servant of Mary should be damned. This assertion may seem hazardous, but, before it is condemned, let us see how it is supported. By true servants of Mary, we do not mean certain devotees, who seem to take advantage of some pious practices in honour of the Mother of God, to sin with more freedom: these are presumptuous persons, who occasion some to condemn us for boasting of the clemency of Mary, as if thereby we encouraged vice, which deserves chastisement instead of mercy. It is not then of such we speak; but rather of those who, to the homage they render the Mother of God, join a sincere desire of being converted; and we again affirm, that they cannot be lost. Father Crasset, Vega, Mendoza, and many other theologians, are of the same opinion. But to prove that they have not lightly advanced it, let us see how far they are supported by the doctors of the Church.

"'Blessed Virgin,' says St. Anselm, 'as it is impossible that he who neglects and despises you can be saved, so it is impossible that he who has recourse to you sincerely can be lost.'

"St. Ephraim styles devotion to our Lady, the charter of freedom from the slavery of hell, &c. He calls her the protectress of those who are running to their damnation; and if it is true (and St. Bernard affirms it), that the blessed Virgin wants neither will nor power to save us—both because her prayers must be heard, and that she is more interested for our salvation than we ourselves—are we not warranted in concluding, that a true servant of Mary's cannot perish?

"A religious man, of the order of St. Bernard, used to say the rosary every day before dinner: once it happened, that being at table, he remembered that he had not paid his accustomed devotions to Mary; he immediately withdrew, and no sooner began his prayer than the Mother of God appeared, clothed in a mantle all ornamented with *Hail Marys*, except one little corner. 'Complete the few Aves which remain unfinished,' said she, 'and I will conduct you to heaven.' He redoubled his devotions, and in a few days this good Mother, after consoling him on his death-bed, introduced his soul into the kingdom of her divine Son."

Again: "O Jesus! O Mary! may your names live in my heart, and in the hearts of all men! May I forget all other names, in order to remember your admirable names alone! O Jesus, my Redeemer! O Mary, my Mother! when my last hour shall come, when my soul shall be at the eve of its departure from the world, grant, I beseech you, that my last words may be, Jesus! Mary! I love you! Jesus! Mary! I give you my heart and my soul. Amen."

The word of God says, "Thou shalt love the *Lord thy God* with all thy heart." The Church of Rome virtually says, "Thou shalt love Mary with all thy heart." To show you still further the idolatrous results of this tenet, I hold in my hand a document describing the state of Rome, A.D. 1835, during the ravages of the cholera. On this occasion the removal of the pestilence is declared to have been effected by the carrying of a wooden doll, supposed to be a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, through the streets, accompanied by the pope and cardinals, and chanting of prayers and litanies:—"Prudent

people, whom no imperative necessity retained in Rome, hastened to leave the city. A second clerical ordinance, commanding eight days' prayers before a miraculous image of the Virgin, which was carried in procession from Mary's Church to Jesus' Church, the pope and cardinals themselves joining in the solemnity; the conversion of the whole city into a church, by the general and solemn illuminations; separate processions, chiefly composed of women and young girls, who, with crucifixes and Madonnas at their heads, went barefooted through the streets, at night, praying and lamenting;—all these were increasing proofs of the violence of the disease. The pope invited all the faithful to repair to the churches, under the promise of dispensations and indulgences for a hundred years. He expressed his confidence that the angel of the Lord, armed with destruction, would (as once before Jerusalem) now pause before the city, which was recognised as the centre of the Christian Church, and for whose welfare there were so many mediators in heaven."

In the eleventh edition of "Gobinet's Instruction for Youth," one of the books used in the national schools of Ireland, and recommended and sanctioned by the Irish Roman authorities, I find the following instructions on the worship of Mary:—

"By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God to obtain from him all that she shall ask. History is full of examples of saints who have preserved this great virtue of chastity in their youth by the assistance of the Queen of Virgins.

"Your devotion to the blessed Virgin must be religious and holy. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin; and, if

you shall fall into that misfortune, have recourse instantly to her, that she may be your intercessor in reconciling you to her Son." Chap. xix. p. 81.

How different the words of John the Evangelist! "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

These, you observe, are specimens of the kind of worship actually paid to the Virgin Mary by the Roman Church. You have heard the theoretical distinction maintained by Roman Catholics, that saints are simply to be venerated and invoked, and that it is lawful to pay only a kind of subordinate and inferior worship to the saints and the Virgin Mary. You have now also heard passages from the "Sacred Heart of Mary," from the "Glories of Mary," by Liguori, from the "Garden of the Soul;" and I now ask you in your own consciences and judgments, whether there are not prayers in these authorized formularies addressed to the Virgin Mary that do amount to the most decided idolatry of which language can be the vehicle? I unhesitatingly charge the Church of Rome with the guilt of idolatry and blasphemy. I say not that any individual in this assembly is an idolater, but I do proclaim, that if the Scriptures are truth, and if these are Romish documents, that these prayers, be they offered by Roman Catholic or by Protestant, be they offered by any individual under heaven, are fraught with poison; that they are dishonourable to God, degrading to man, and directly opposed to the injunction of our blessed Saviour, who has said, in language the most emphatic and decisive, "Come" (not to Mary, not to saints,) but "come unto ME, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." And again, "Whatsoever ye

shall ask in *my* name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." And again, in Acts ii. 21—"Whosoever shall call upon the *name of the Lord* shall be saved." And again, our Lord has recorded it in Luke ii. 2; when the disciples came to him and said, "Teach us to pray," what did our Lord reply? He said unto them, "When ye pray, say" (not "O Mary," but) "Our Father, who art in heaven," &c. Our Lord made no such distinctions. They, the apostles, said, "Teach us how to pray," in the absolute extent of the words; and our Lord taught them to pray. Beautiful indeed, and impressive, was the spectacle which was then presented: the great Lord of heaven and earth bending his knee as a Mediator between God and man, with his ransomed and redeemed family around him, himself officiating as their spokesman, and saying, "Our Father, who art in heaven; hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done," &c. This the disciples necessarily understood as prayer to God, and that our Lord, when teaching them to pray, taught them to pray only unto God; prayer meaning of necessity petition to God. But my learned antagonist will admit that prayers and praises are described in Scripture as spiritual sacrifices. You will all recollect that these are the only sacrifices instituted under the New-Testament economy; viz. the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise. Hence we read in Scripture that we are to "offer sacrifices of prayer and praise to God continually." Now, my opponent will admit that sacrifice is to be offered to God only; and if sacrifices are to be offered only to God, and if prayer and praise be the Christian sacrifice, then I contend that our sacrifices (for "we are priests unto God") are to be laid on Christ, who is the

eternal and indestructible altar, and to be offered to God in the name of Jesus Christ, through the strength and inspiration of the Spirit.

Upon these grounds, therefore, and others which I shall state presently, I do maintain that the worship given to saints is impiously stolen from God, and that which is practically given to the Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome is most superstitious and idolatrous; and I call on my learned antagonist to bring forward sound and satisfactory reasons why we are not to pronounce such a verdict on that worship, and further to adduce from the pages of inspiration such proofs of *Doulia* and *Hyper-doulia* being rendered to the Virgin Mary, as will satisfy every dispassionate hearer, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, that the worship thus rendered is not idolatrous, but scriptural, and consonant with Christian worship. For my own part, I have been taught throughout, that it is unworthy even of man—fallen as he is, changed and guilty as he has become—I hold it, I say, derogatory even to the remains of man's moral dignity, to bow the knee before the most exalted creature, and to pay the worship to that creature which is given in the formularies and rituals of the Church of Rome! No; my Roman Catholic friends, assert your true dignity!—you are called to be “priests unto God”—you are invited to become ransomed believers by the blood of Jesus: assert your dignity; go into the Holy of Holies at once, which has been flung wide open, when the veil of the temple was rent in twain. “Go with boldness,” says the apostle, “to a throne of grace, and ask mercy and grace to help you in time of need.” Banish far from you every saint of earth. If they were to come and stand in your way, tell them, ‘I need not your assistance; I

have a Father, whose bosom is a ready refuge for the poorest sinner. I have a most gracious Saviour and Lord, washed in whose blood I shall be made “whiter than snow;” I have a Holy Spirit to guide me in reading his holy word, and to enable me to give expression to my wants and woes in prayer; and having God interceding in heaven, and God dwelling and pleading in my heart, I am borne up in the everlasting arms of mercy and love, and neither saint nor sinner shall debar me from the sweet and exalted privilege of going at once to God, in the name of Christ Jesus our Lord.’

[Here the rev. gentleman's hour terminated.]

MR. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen—I never rose more disappointed in the whole course of my life than I do this evening. I did expect, after the solemn pledge which I gave my learned friend, namely, to confine myself entirely to the Bible this evening, that he would have taken up that sacred book into his hands in an awful and in a serious manner, and not have launched out into the bitter invective, the ridicule, the taunts, and the sneers of the infidel, in which he has indulged in alluding to the different practices of our religion. The learned gentleman tells me he is totally exempt from anything like bitter feeling towards the Catholic, and he repeats this avowal over and over again, with his usual flowing, unobstructed, mellifluousness of tongue; but step by step, as he proceeds, he takes an opportunity of persuading me, and persuading all Catholics present, that the maxim I conceive to be uppermost in his mind, on entering this room this evening, is the same which he has exemplified on the former ones; namely, the maxim of Horace, which he seems system-

atically to have impressed on his memory, and which he himself has at length quoted, as being the quintessence of wisdom in theological disputation:—" *Spectatum admissum teneatis amici?* " The broad meaning of which Latin verse of my learned friend's quoting is—"I, (Cumming) being totally unable to encounter my antagonist, Mr. French, with the weapons of logic, will make my most formidable onset on his religion with the weapons of ridicule, by making that which is the subject of his reverence and veneration the subject of your laughter. Yes, if I cannot crush the Catholic champion with the solidity of argument, I will overwhelm him by the weight of ridicule and satire." The learned gentleman, however, would do well to remember, that, in adopting such a line of disputation, he is treading precisely in the steps of the apostate Julian. The reverend gentleman tells me (I use his own words) that he wishes "to blast our dark and apostate system with spiritual weapons." Now I also would wish with equal eagerness to blast that whole system of sacrilegious pollution, and roaring, bellowing, wide-yawning fanaticism, which passes under the name of Scotch Calvinism; but my ambition is, to knock its standard-bearers on the head with the staff of solid, substantial argument, for I know no other. But it does appear to me, that my reverend antagonist is much more deeply read in the writings of the apostate Julian than in those of the holy fathers; the grand lesson of that apostle of Paganism to his disciples was, in their disputes with Christians, not to descend to the seriousness of argument, but to make them writhe and smart under the lash of raillery and derision; to point the finger of scorn at their idolatrous altar, their man of God, their ablution of sin by

plunging into water, in one word, their holy and adorable trinity. Yes, my friends, this apt scholar of that mighty master, Julian the Apostate, has read, no doubt, with peculiar attention, those pages of his works where he so emphatically recommends to the Pagans not to draw the pen and wield it in a serious manner against the awful mysteries of our religion; but to wound, and gail, and mortify the feelings of Christians by every species of contemptuous ridicule—by laughing at their good men, "as pleasant children"—by ridiculing everything they deemed sacred—by making them the objects of incessant and never-ending ridicule. Such was the precept of the apostate Julian, and my learned friend, this evening, acts up to its full spirit and its widest compass.

My learned friend tells me he has a most confirmed antipathy to the system, but that he has none to us as individuals. Really, gentlemen, wishing to give him credit for a good heart and sincere intentions, it is very difficult to be so charitable on such an occasion as to acquit him of all intention of giving us pain. Why has he not the common honesty to come forward into the field of argumentation, to combat our articles of faith, and to keep to those alone, and never wander from them by giving us a long list of different books, and the opinions of different divines in different colleges, such as Delahogue and several others? I told him before, that I have a right to differ from Delahogue, or any other divine or theologian, *salva compage fidei*, except on articles of faith—that if, taking up the Bible this evening, I light on a passage of a metaphorical nature, susceptible of a twofold, or a fourfold interpretation, I have a right to take which I like, without

paying the least deference to Delahogue, or St. Liguori, or St. Augustine, or St. Jerome, or any other man. Why, then, does he dwell on so unessential a point? Why does he not meet me foot to foot, and discuss the question fairly? He begs of us CATHOLICS, in his usually pathetic manner, to sink all our differences into the cause of Christ Jesus. I have told him over and over again that that sacred Name, at the sound of which the CATHOLIC, whether here or in church, ever inclines his head, but to which the Protestant (by some strange inconsistency) does not bow to except in the church—that that sacred name, I say, ought not to be thus desecrated by such familiar mention on his part, at a time that he is violating the holy precepts of him that bore it, by calumniating the most fervent of his adorers. I have told the learned gentleman repeatedly that we never say a prayer to the Virgin that does not centre ultimately in our ardent love for the blessed Jesus; and I have told him, over and over again, that it is the same with all the saints of the Church; and I now tell him, by one sweeping answer to all this long list of calumnies against us, that he has not been able—notwithstanding the “oriental” epithets which are applied to the Virgin—and which I most sincerely approve of—notwithstanding all that—and it is an inability that has grieved him to the heart—he has not *been able* to point out one single prayer where we have said, “O Virgin, have mercy upon us!” or where we have spoken to her in any other language than, “Pray for us!” or where that prayer has not ended in the name of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Ghost, Amen; or through the name of Jesus Christ! No, I have told him, in as

emphatic language as I could do, that degrees of comparison between the mother and the Son are blasphemous and idolatrous.

And now let me ask, my friends, what has been the result of all his ransacking of Catholic prayer-books, and ranging through all their diversities of expression, in imploring the intercession alluded to? Why, gentlemen, it has been a total frustration of those hopes and wishes which he had raised among you, namely, of detecting us in manifest and gross idolatry. He has proved, by every prayer that he has read, that through Jesus Christ our Lord every favour from this intercessory practice is uniformly sued for and expected. In one word, he has confirmed, he has proved our theory, by laying before you our rule of action, which carries with it its own explication, and needs no other to defend us from the uncharitable distortion of my reverend antagonist. He has laid considerable emphasis on the word negotiate, which he finds in one of our prayer-books—a word, which, however inelegant it may be, is extremely apt in expressing our meaning in this our recourse to angels and saints, namely, to solicit for us *that*, which of themselves they cannot give. The utmost, therefore, that the learned gentleman has been able to effect, by all his vast profusion of words upon this subject, is, to point out some inelegancies, some imperfections of diction in the prayers we use—some phrases which have had the power of exciting his risibility; but not one single expression has he *been able* to lay before you capable of giving the least enlargement to our tenet, and bringing us in guilty before you of investing angels and saints, either with the dignity, the power, or the majesty of God.

Again. My learned friend, who professes to be so consummately skilled in the Hebrew, has told you that, in the book of Joshua, v. 13, the angel says, "*As Captain of the Lord's Host am I come. And Joshua fell on his face and did worship;*" and that this Captain of the Host whom Joshua worshipped was none other than Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts; but what the learned gentleman, Hebraically learned, has forgotten to tell you is, that the archangel Michael is called Captain in Daniel—"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great captain which standeth for the children of thy people." (Daniel xii. 1.) And mark, though your Bible translates "prince" (as our Bible uniformly does), the Hebrew word ought to be translated here "captain," if *captain* be the accurate translation in the text referred to in Joshua, inasmuch as the Hebrew word (*sar*) is the same in both, as my Hebrew friend well knows, or at least ought to know. So that I contend, that this captain of the Lord's Host was the archangel Michael—that identical spirit that *disputed with Satan about the body of Moses*; the same of whom it is said in Revelation xii. 7: "Michael and his angels fought against the dragon." And I contend, moreover, that it is equally derogatory to the majesty of the tremendous God to come down on earth, either to wrestle with Jacob, or to dispute with Satan. Such interpretations are worthy the mouth of one whose tutelary angel, in studying the Holy Scriptures, is no other than the gloomy Calvin.

Thus, you see, my friends, I will not yield to my reverend antagonist, who assumes to be lord of the Bible, to make it speak whatever language he thinks proper, bestriding it like a huge colossus, and crying out per-

petually, that he alone comprehends "*what is its breadth, and length, and depth, and height.*" I, for my part, spurn away the dictates of his infallibility with inexpressible contempt and scorn. I will no more believe that God Almighty, as is suggested by the reverend gentleman, condescended to wrestle with Jacob, than I will believe that he condescended in Jude to contend with Satan for the body of Moses. No, my friends, it is a foul explanation of the Bible; it is a glance at the sacred page unworthy of a celestial eye, but such as might naturally be expected from one that has been accustomed from its first opening to roll in the clouds and obscurity of Calvinistic theology. To admit such a doctrine would be at once to annihilate all intercourse between heaven and earth, without the immediate descent of God himself. When Gabriel was sent down to the Virgin Mary, according to my friend's logic, it must have been a mere figurative expression for the descent of God himself; that is, it must stand for *God sent himself in the form of an angel.*

The Litany of Loretto has been read through with infinite delight, in doing which my reverend friend has acted with steady adherence to the precept of that exalted master, in whose school he seems to have been so regularly trained, and so sublimely nurtured, namely, the apostate Julian. The Litany of Loretto—a litany which I repeat every morning and night with infinite satisfaction, because I know I am at the same time paying homage to the blessed and adorable Jesus—I know there is no "oriental" phrase in the Litany of Loretto, which goes beyond that which I yesterday read you from that immovably-authenticated monument of antiquity, the Liturgy of St.

James, where, you may remember, she is called "the Spiritual Paradise." If the apostle James could call her so, are not we justified, in the nineteenth century, in repeating words similar to that kind of expression, when we wish to paint in mortal language the summit of all excellence, conferred upon a created being by the blessed arm of its Creator? She, the blessed Virgin, is also called in that litany "the Morning Star." This excited all the indignation of my friend—this sounds in his ear like blasphemy and idolatry; in mine, none. Do I not find in the Gospel, which my friend declares he is so attached to—do I not find in Scripture, from the mouth of God, that glory is to be attributed to him, and to him alone? do I not find that very word by Christ himself, and by his inspired writers, applied to men? This is what I am going to prove this evening, and show you also that the word "adore" in Hebrew is used for the worship of God and the worship of men. Are you not told, I say, that glory is to be given to none but God? Are you not told also, that glory and honour are attributable to man?

Prov. xxi. 21: "He that followeth after righteousness and mercy, findeth life, righteousness, and honour." Prov. xxv. 2: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing; but the honour of kings is to search out a matter." Here mark, my friends, the unjustifiable change of the same Hebrew word *glory* into *honour*, when the Psalmist applies it to man. This Protestant alteration is totally uncountenanced by the Bible. The Catholic version, ever conscientiously true to the divine original, has it thus:—"It is the *glory* of God to conceal the word, and the *glory* of kings to search the speech." And yet, why this change? Does

not St. Paul say, "But *glory, honour, and peace* to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile?" Rom. ii. 10.

Now, as to the expression *Morning Star*, which my learned antagonist deems to be one too transcendent to be applied to Mary, I would again refer you to St. Paul, for proof that diversity of shades of meaning, in the application of the self-same word, is not at variance with the usage of the Gospel. St. Paul says—"There is one *glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another in glory.*" 1 Cor. xv. 41. I would say, therefore, when I call the blessed Virgin the *Morning Star*, my meaning solely is, that she was *the blessed among women*, who brought forth into the world that *blessed fruit called Jesus*, without whom both Mary and the stars themselves would be destitute of one ray of glory. Where, I ask then, is the want of coherence and propriety in calling Jesus the *Morning Star* in one sense, and Mary the *Morning Star* in another? By the light of the *Morning Star*, Mary, I seek the Illuminator of all the stars of the firmament, and I adore Him without adoring her; as the *Magi* by the light of the glittering star, which by them might not be inappropriately called the *Morning Star*, sought and found the blessed Infant, and fell down in adoration at his feet, honouring, but not adoring, the all-blessed mother who presented to them the Man-God;—and who was consequently more worthy, for such a presentation, to be designated by the name of *Morning Star*, in point of intrinsic brightness, than that luminous body itself by the light of which, in the canopy of heaven, they were conducted to the lowly mansion where the *Lord of glory*

lay unfolded in the arms of Mary. Away, then, my friends, with the convulsive strains of my reverend antagonist, to merge the ever-Catholic veneration for the name of Mary into the gulph of idolatry.

Again, my reverend antagonist has ridiculed the idea of the blessed Virgin being the "Refuge of Sinners." True, she is, in our Church, looked upon and revered as the refuge of sinners; but mark, my friends (what my antagonist prays you most earnestly *not* to mark), it is in her *intercessory character* only that we assign to her this title. It is not a vain nicety of distinction which we ingeniously strike out in order to conceal our idolatry, as my antagonist, in the gloomy suspicions that deform his mind, will probably exclaim; but it is a solid and eternal distinction between Jesus and Mary, which I hope, once for all, to impress upon your minds for ever—namely, that we *pray for the prayer* of Mary, and nothing more; yes, my friends, every thing beyond that, as to any power of Mary, is calumny, is virulence—ay, the base, malignant imputation of enemies, eternally confounded in argument, and *Cucus-like*, ever-breathing forth from their pestilential jaws volumes of new-collected smoke against us.

What, then, my friends, is the true meaning of this subordinate intercession? To describe the great intercession of our blessed Lord (if I must go to the etymology of the language), *intercedo* means to walk or go between; and, in the sense in which it is used, it means walking between God and man, and reconciling God to man; and no one can accomplish this grand task but the Saviour, by the bloody death he suffered on the cross. As to that great intercession, there is but one. But that there are other kinds of intercession, my friend knows, from

the pages of that book which he clings to so unrelinquishably when it suits his purpose, and which he abandons on other occasions with such facile elasticity of bound, when it does not suit his purpose. My learned friend knows that in that very book St. Paul employs the most ardent prayers to his fellow-creatures here on earth. For instance—"Now, I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for love of the Spirit, that ye strive *together with me* in your prayers to God for me." Rom. xv. 30.

Oh! my friends, why was not St. Paul interrupted at the utterance of this request, by a sudden burst of indignation on the part of some roaring enthusiast, reminding him of the one, sole, grand intercession, and directing him, with the infallible authority of my learned antagonist, to throw the vile prayers of mortals "to the bats and moles," and to cry out "*Abba, Father?*"

But, to speak with all seriousness. My friends, is it not preposterous—is it not most nauseatingly repulsive, to hear a theologian, who would fain be denominated also a logician forsooth, and not a mere tinsel orator—to hear such a man, I say, most bitterly reproving the Catholic for having recourse to the intercession of the blessed Virgin, when St. Paul himself, in the most lowly, suppliant manner, solicits the *mediation* of one as far inferior to the Virgin in glory as the learned gentleman, even with all the illumination of Calvinism around him, is inferior to the great St. Paul. For, tell me, is there not intercession there, my friends? Is it in the power of any fair, rational system of logic to do away with intercession there? By what authority can the learned gentleman, may I know, pronounce, that the moment St. Paul is dead, his prayers become inefficacious?

What infallibility is invested on the rock (as he calls it) of the Scottish Church, that should teach him to lay it down as a recognised tenet of my creed, that the very moment the most illustrious of apostles and evangelists is swept away from this earth, he, forsooth, is nothing, from that moment, but dead inanimate matter, sunk like the voluptuary, in his expectations at least, into the tomb of everlasting silence? Then the learned gentleman seems to have caught me in a kind of entanglement—namely, that saints of the ancient Testament could not possibly be available to us by their prayers, since they were *in limbo* before the ascension of our blessed Saviour. That is not an article of my creed, or an article with regard to the saints in purgatory. I must beg the learned gentleman to be a little better versed in our principles before he again enters on such an argument. It is not! On the contrary, if I know a man has lived a virtuous and a pious life to have gone to the other world, admired by every one for his well-attested sanctity and his virtue, for aught I know he might be in purgatory; but if the traces of his virtues and his piety were deeply impressed on my mind, I confess I might be induced to breathe a prayer for his assistance, and I have no doubt that, if in purgatory, he might assist me by his prayers to heaven.

The learned gentleman then calls my attention to the rich man in hell praying to father Abraham in heaven, and he tells me very gravely (forgetting the illogical concession he is making) he tells me that he received a negative! Why, gentlemen, if that be the case with regard to hell, I must say, in the first place, it is an article of our faith to believe, *in infernis nulla redemptio*:

in hell there is no redemption. There, any one who has had the misfortune to shut his ears against the voice of truth, and has not regulated his life according to the principles of piety and virtue, and of the religion which Christ came to establish, there remains no hope to him, no alternative of any kind.

I need not acquaint my friend that the chief good of this discussion will consist in the truth being elicited on the one side or on the other; and, as all have to answer for it at the last dread assize, it will certainly be the incumbent duty of you all, not to weigh in the balances, with nice discrimination, who was the more glowing, the more flowing orator of the two, or who tickled your fancy most by the charms, the fascination of his eloquence, the vividness of his ideas; but who it was that used the most convincing and overpowering arguments—who traced his religion up, the most clearly and unerringly, to the days of the apostles and evangelists. But I was going to observe, my friend said that the rich man received a negative. I ask him—(for this is what I call an illogical concession)—I ask him, how he could receive a negative? How could Abraham in heaven, according to his doctrine, know any thing about it? That is the entanglement to which I allude. How could Abraham know anything about things in hell? He asks me (if I implore the intercession of saints) Have they ubiquity? have they omnipresence? Now we do not maintain it as an article of our creed that the saints are acquainted with what passes in this world, except through the medium of some instantaneous intuition given to them by the Almighty Lord. But is it not as easy for Christ to communicate instantaneously whatever he

wills to the spirits in heaven, as it is for him to communicate things to us by his prophets on earth? My friend will not deny that the prophets have been suddenly acquainted with things from the Almighty which they were ignorant of before, and which he commanded them to make known. My learned friend then calls my attention to the Bollandists, and he says that the Catholic Church must be charged with the responsibility of their eighty folio volumes. I tell the learned gentleman (as I told him before, whenever he has repeated that charge as to the Bollandists) that they are not obliged to be believed in by any part of the Christian community. There is a great deal of laborious research in the Bollandists, a great deal of knowledge various and extensive, set off with all the beauties of style; but there may be in them a great number of tales—legendary tales—in these Bollandists, which we Catholics smile at quite as much as the learned gentleman does, though perhaps more innocently, because, in smiling at them, they mean to wound the feelings of no mortal being on earth.

Gentlemen, I really have to apologize to you for having squandered so much time in the refutation of, I must say, charges apparently so malevolent. Whatever I may think of the good nature of my friend in general, I think, after the severe manner in which I retorted his treatment the other evening, that he might have come imbued with the milk of Christianity a little more sweetly into this room this evening. It quite unnerves me, I candidly confess. Such is the devotion which I cherish towards the mother of God (and, as I told you before, that devotion always hinges on an ardent affection for our Blessed Redeemer), that I cannot hear what sounds in

my ear like blasphemy without being shattered in my nerves, and almost rendered incapable of proceeding with my usual facility. But, gentlemen, I must not even so be driven from the subject. Having established, on the last occasion when I had the honour of addressing you—having established, by a regular and connected series of proofs, drawn from historical records of antiquity, the primitiveness of the religion which I profess—having established it by documents, not only uncontroverted, but even uncontested by my learned antagonist—I raise my front this evening with the conscious dignity of bearing two glorious titles impressed upon it—namely, CATHOLIC and APOSTOLIC; and I will endeavour to prove to you, every step I take, by continued appeals to the sacred archives in which that most precious of all volumes (the Bible) is enrolled, my rightful, my indisputable title to those glorious adornments. And now, gentlemen, though I am fully satisfied that you are by this time amply convinced of my willingness to appeal to the Bible in corroboration of every Catholic dogma, still I cannot pass over unnoticed one observation of my learned friend.

Perhaps the learned gentleman, in endeavouring to impress upon you that I was averse to substantiate my tenets by the Bible, perhaps he may have confounded one subject with another. I have more than once—indeed I believe in his hearing—on former occasions expressed something of a feeling of nausea at the contamination of the liquid stream that runs through the sacred book by the admixture of Protestant infusion; in turning, I say, that stream into our vernacular language. That, my friends, is what my opponent calls my averseness to the Bible. The plain logic of his posi-

tion is—*Because* I do not admire the arm that darkens and corrupts it, *therefore* I do not love the splendour emitted by it, *in its uncorrupted state*.

Before, however, I proceed once more to open the Bible, I must do away with another error which my learned antagonist endeavoured to inculcate upon you : which is, that Dr. Doyle — our celebrated Dr. Doyle—was an encomiast of the English Bible. Now, gentlemen, it is not so ; Dr. Doyle admired it as to the beauty of its style, but he deprecated it as to the infidelity of its translation. In fact, my friends, on some future occasion I hope to show you that you have not the *whole* Bible, that you have but a part of the Bible. I hope to show you, likewise, that in the part you have retained there are many gross, palpable, indefensibly gross and palpable errors, deliberately committed by the translators, in order to impose upon the British public. The Bible of the Church of England, or call it (if you please) the Bible of the Church of Scotland—(I take it to be a twin-brother)—the Bible of the Church of England, I say, cannot be better characterized than by the pithiness of expression by which a French critic described a translation, from the Greek of the historian Thucydides, into his language, namely, *la belle infidèle*, which, translated into English, signifies, “*the beautiful traitoress*.” The reason I mention this on the present occasion is, because, in the line of argument I am about to adopt—though I have abundance of matter to argue upon in those portions of the Bible you retain, to refute all the assertions of my antagonist—still I am defrauded by the mutilation that has been made at the Reformation, only about three centuries past—I am defrauded of a

vital part of the Bible, where I could have proved to you still more clearly the Invocation of Angels and Saints. Though I shall not dwell upon these arguments on the present occasion, still I shall beg leave, before I begin to repeat them, to state that, in pledging myself to limit myself entirely to the Bible, I never pledged myself to only a part of it, or that I would abandon what I call the original Bible, in all its integrity. Tobias, which you call the Apocrypha—and which all the Catholic world, ever since the Council of Carthage in three hundred and ninety-eight, enumerating the canonical books, called canonical,—and which the whole world received until the Reformation, when it pleased the wise heads of this nation (the parliamentary heads) to lop off certain books of the Bible, and hand you down a part of it—I say until then this Bible was received in the whole world. The other churches who separated from us receive it still over the whole world, and look on it as canonical as any other book. In the book of Tobias, xii. 12, the angel Raphael says, “*When thou didst pray with tears, and didst bury the dead, and left thy dinner, and didst hide the dead by day in thy house, and by night didst bury them, I offered up thy prayer to our Lord.*”

15. “*For I am Raphael, an angel, one of the seven which assist before the Lord.*”

And in the Second Book of Maccabees, xv. 12, Judas relates a vision in the following manner: His words are, “*And the vision was in this manner ; Onias, who had been the high priest, a good and benign man, reverend to behold, modest of manners, and comely of speech, and who from a child was exercised in virtues, that he, stretching forth the hands, prayed for all the people*

of the Jews. After this, that there appeared also another man, marvelous for age, and glory, and for the part of great dignity about him. And that Onias, answering, said, 'This is a lover of his brethren and of the people of Isreal: this is he that prayeth much for the people, and for the whole city, Jeremy, the prophet of God.' "

And now, my friends, as our Catholic annotators on the passage say, Protestants have no better evasion, when pressed with its incumbent force, than by denying the authority of the book; in plain English, Protestants have an *inspiration* that the author of it was *not inspired*! Yes, every Protestant reads *inspiringly*, or rather *inspiredly*, that the sublime author of this book, who thus describes the punishment of the impious Antiochus, swelling in anger against the people of God, was altogether uninspired when he wrote it:—"And he that seemed to himself to rule even over the waves of the sea, replenished with pride above the measure of man, and to weigh the heights of mountains in the balance, now being humbled to the ground, was carried in a portative seat, testifying the manifest power of God in himself." —Mac. ix. 8.

Oh! what a felicity is it to have the understanding irradiated by the inborn light of Protestantism, so as to distinguish in an instant, *primo intuitu*, the language of celestial intelligence from the mimic accents of the terrestrial! But, gentlemen, I keep this out of the question on the present occasion; for though I adhere with firm unrelinquishing grasp, not to be loosened by an Act of Parliament, to that book as a vital part of the Gospel, without believing in which I could not obtain salvation, because I must either have the whole Bible, or no

Bible at all—I say, though that be the case, I shall not use it as any part of my corroborative argumentation this evening. I need it not. I shall direct the attention of my learned friend once more, by a kind of *tout ensemble* glance, to Psalm xxxiv. 7:—"The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." Then, Psalm xci. 11:—"For he shall give his angels charge over thee to keep thee in all thy ways." Then, same Psalm, 12:—"They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Then, Psalm ciii. 20:—"Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." [Some interruption here occurred, and the learned gentleman requested silence.] Then Revelations, i. 4:—"John to the seven churches that are in Asia, Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne." I call the particular attention of my friend to this, and should be glad if he will honour me so far as to comply with my recommendation to note down every word of it. Let us ponder deliberately upon this, and not run over it with the breathless rapidity with which my learned friend would wish to whirl me along, when I hold that sacred book in my hand. "*Grace and peace!*" Now, drink in the words—"Grace and peace unto you." Peace from whom? "From Him who is, and who was, and who is to come." If you ask who that is, of course I shall reply, with my learned friend, the Lord Jesus Christ. But mark, it says, "AND from the seven spirits which are before his throne," from which throne, it appears, they

possess the power of sending that "*grace and peace*" unto us. Really, I wonder that the learned gentleman does not start up from his place and cry out *blasphemy*, when I talk, even with John the Evangelist to embolden me, of angels sending down *grace and peace* to mortal men! Again, I quote Rev. v. 8 :—"And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and the four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints."

Again, Rev. viii. 3 :—"And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it, with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which is before the throne." Why, gentlemen, if my learned friend will permit me to judge for myself, in reading Scripture (as I am determined to do this day), I declare, with all the solemnity of truth—and I could ratify it by an oath—that if there ever was a lively description of the sublimity of our Holy Catholic Church upon earth, I believe the prophet had it in view when he penned this magnificent and sublimely-beautiful description, and, from that day that he wrote this down to the present day, I believe that lively image of it has been stamped on its majestic columns, and on those of no other church whatever; and, moreover, that from that day to this—that from that Church prayers have ascended to the blessed God, through the intercession of saints and of angels. Again, I quote Luke xv. 7 :—"Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." I told you that no later than a few days ago, when I was at

Reading, at a Bible meeting, one gentleman there present, in order to elicit sums of money from the gaping rustics around him, told them that the angels in heaven were actually looking down, at that moment, rejoicing at the circulation of the Bible, which circulation would be rapidly increased that evening by their donations. [Laughter.] Oh, thought I, this is a curious thing! How often have I been told by Protestants, when I pray to saints, I have been asked, "Can they hear my prayers?" This question has been put to me over and over again, and yet, when the Bible is to be circulated by large sums of money, then come the angels, looking down, and rejoicing at the proceedings on earth! But, gentlemen, depend on it, it is not by the circulation of the Bible that you will ever convert nations to God. Take but the lives of the missionaries, as mentioned by Milner, the Protestant historian—look at the divine spirit by which they were prompted—their self-abnegation—their contempt for all earthly pleasure in the cause of their Redeemer, for whom they were willing to suffer. Look at what is going forward at the present moment! Look at the virulent pages of the Scottish magazine called "*Blackwood's Magazine*"—look at whole pages filled with all the virulence of invective against us; and yet, at last, in order to stimulate you Protestants to exertion, acknowledging, that though Protestants cannot get into China, yet that—to your shame—the CATHOLIC priests have got there, and been put to the rack and the torture by hundreds and thousands; and there they are, at the present day, shedding their blood exultingly in the cause of Him in whose holy service they grew poor, at least as to worldly substance, whilst ye

[turning to Mr. Cumming], ministers of Protestant churches, grow rich, and do nothing but live daintily and preach gaudily. So much as to these idolatrous priests, who pray for the sympathy of saints, and the intercession of the BLESSED VIRGIN. Read the life of a St. Francis Xavier—look at the innumerable Pagans converted by his holy life; look at the admissions of Protestants—look at the pages of some of your Methodists, who actually wanted to rob the CATHOLIC Church of that glorious missionary, by declaring that he (St. Francis Xavier) was a *Methodist*. Look and see the purity of their lives, wherever you are—whatever climate you may visit, look narrowly at the persevering CATHOLIC priest, and you will see that he is a man of God at every step, in every action of his life; and if at any time it should please the Almighty to send some conspicuous “*scourge to take vengeance for our iniquities,*” (Judith vii. 20,) “*to smile us with some pestilence,*” (Numb. xiv. 12,) to afflict us, for instance, with the long-visiting and keenly-remembered cholera, “*for the trespass that we have trespassed against him,*” (Levit. xxvi. 40)—depend upon it, my ardently-beloved Protestants—for whose salvation I am so unfeignedly solicitous—you will ever find the Catholic priest in the cottages, or rather, I should say, in the hovels of the suffering and the poor, administering to them spiritual consolation. Called up in the dead of night, he goes through the pelting storm with alacrity, to perform the functions of his duty; and many and many a time have I myself seen the late Cardinal Weld thus moving onward to the performance of his duty. Such instances, I grant, may occur in the Church of England, as well as in ours; but oh, how rare! At Winchester, about

forty years ago, when a pestilential contagious disease broke out in that town, the Catholic priests were to be found among the people, to the number of about five or six hundred—French priests, fugitives from the great atheistical revolution, went about visiting the poor, at a time when many of them were dying without the consolations of religion; when not a parson, amidst innumerable parsons, was to be found of spiritual daring sufficient to out-brave the danger, and “*to make Israel strengthen himself and sit upon the bed,*” (Gen. xlviii. 2.) It was then (for the contagion at length reached the house in which the Catholic priests resided), whilst the Protestant servants of their community were dying one after the other, shamefully, dastardly, fraudulently deserted by their Protestant pastors, that those same French priests alluded to took up the pen and wrote an expostulatory letter to the primates, saying, “It was a shame to let the sheep of their fold die like dogs.” And mark, my friends, when these deserted sheep saw the zeal, the fervour, the devotedness of the true priest, many of them exclaimed, with their dying lips, “Oh! this, beyond doubt, must be the true religion!”

And now, my friends, mark the philosophically-wise, spontaneously-flowing answer from the sons of self-interest, the dignitaries of the Church of England, in that seat of Protestant learning and orthodoxy, the town of Winchester:—

“Gentlemen of the French clergy, we have received your expostulatory letter, and can only say, in reply, that although we do not shrink from death more than you do, in the exercise of our pastoral functions, yet we owe it to our duty, at the same time, not to run the risk of carrying a contagious fever into the bosom of our families.”

Such was the purport of the letter. I quote from memory. Here, gentlemen, in this acting of Protestant clergymen, you have experimental evidence that St. Paul did not overpaint the thing when he said—"He that is not married careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife." (1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.) Whereas, the Catholic priests above alluded to had ever uppermost in their minds the exhortation of that same Apostle, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. xii. 1.

Such, then, as to our Catholic Clergy, is the glorious record. Talk of idolatry! Oh, sublime idolaters! oh, ardent lovers of your crucified Lord and Saviour—ye believers in guardian angels—ye angelical lovers—how are ye calumniated! Oh, I could cry out, most appropriately (turning to my reverend antagonist), "Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from calumny and guile," and thou wilt work out thy salvation with much greater security. "I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." My friend has quoted this, and he will correct me if I am wrong:—"My little children, these things I write unto you that ye sin not;" but he quoted the latter part also, namely, "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins."

Now, what my reverend friend wanted to inculcate on you is, that

we make the blessed Virgin a propitiation for our sins. If we do, we are guilty of gross blasphemy, and, mark this, my reverend friend, we shall be lost to all eternity. It is by the blood of Christ Jesus alone that we are redeemed; he alone is the true propitiatory—that alone is the real ransom which he paid for our sins; he is the sole intercessor. By any other intercessor—by any other *mediator of the New Testament*, "*they which are called will never receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*" Heb. ix. 15. But mark! that does not do away with the plain declaration of the Gospel, and of the Bible, which I shall prove to you before I finish this evening, (though I have not sufficient time to introduce all my arguments)—that does not in the least interfere with the doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, which has been transmitted from age to age from the times of the apostles, as I have proved to the conviction of every candid and impartial hearer in this assembly, and which stands uncontradicted by any one argument on the part of my learned friend, save and except that of frothy declamation. When I proved to you, the other evening, the advocacy of angels and saints from that sublime monument of antiquity, St. James's Liturgy, what was his philosophical mode of proceeding upon the occasion? Why, it was one that would certainly have met with the warm approbation of that exquisitely delightful judge in these matters, the apostate Julian, with his *risum teneatis amici*. [Laughter.] I mean, gentlemen, his resort was, to cast his eyes around him, and see if there was not some laughing face to which he might make appeal, and then to ask triumphantly the owner of that face, and its fanatical fac-similes in abundance at its side, whether those

said liturgies did not amply speak for themselves, without the necessity of any comment, *that they are vain things, and a work of errors worthy to be laughed at.* But is this the way, my friends—is this Julian-the-Apostate way to be adopted in polemics, as of acknowledged efficacy in invalidating works of antiquity demonstrably proved; and primitiveness, with the most methodical accuracy regularly traced and verified? No, my friends, these liturgies “*stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.*” Psalm xci. 8.

Gentlemen, if the task was ever gloriously performed of tracing up my Church and all its articles to the days of the apostles, it was performed on the last evening. “The memory of the just is blessed,” says the prophet, (chap. x. ver. 7,) “but the name of the wicked shall rot.” Again—“The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.” (Psalm cxii. 6.) The name of the just, therefore, being blessed, according to the Scripture phrase, we say, “Blessed St. Athanasius, pray for us; blessed Ignatius Martyr, pray for us; blessed Catherine, pray for us; blessed St. Agnes, pray for us;” or to any other saint, as he or she may have been eminent and illustrious for either his or her virtues, we attach the term “blessed;” and we sin not in so doing, but we increase in love every day of our lives most strenuously for our blessed Redeemer, by the veneration which we pay to his saints; neither does it detract from his honour or his glory; nay, to speak plainly, it is madness, it is bold and daring blasphemy, it is proud Luciferian uprising against every passage of the Bible alluding to it, to say that the Intercession of Saints invalidates the grand mediation, or is the least disparagement to the glory and honour of God. I

will now call the attention of my friend to St. Luke; and here, again, he will try to do away with the strength of this irresistible passage—this prediction, which we prove accomplished every day of our lives in our church, but which is not so in yours—I say, he will endeavour to do it all away, because the phrase, “blessed for all generations,” is used in other parts of ancient Scripture. “Blessed art thou among women,” said the angel; and she said, “Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?” Now, the Rev. Dr. Burton, in his Treatise against Unitarians, who was Professor of Divinity at Oxford a few years ago—Dr. Burton, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, says that “unless you mean to become an Unitarian, you must say that ‘the mother of my Lord’ means the ‘mother of my God.’” That is Dr. Burton’s opinion; it is mine also; can it be said, this evening, it is not the opinion of my infallible friend? [Laughter.]

And now, my friends, though I am about to give my learned opponent no invitation to hilarity, inasmuch as (if Ecclesiasticus speak right) “*music in mourning is a tale out of time,*” (Ecclus. xxii. 6,) and my learned friend is very visibly dejected at the course my argument is taking [laughter]—turn we to the *Magnificat*; yes, my friends, turn we to that divine hymn; for to me, I candidly confess, in the words of the same *inspired* writer just cited—“Its remembrance shall be sweet as honey in every mouth, and as music in banquet of wine.” Ecclus. xlix. 2.

“And Mary said: My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Because he hath regarded the humility of his hand-maid: for behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is

mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is his name. And his mercy is from generation to generation, to them that fear him. He hath showed might in his arm: he hath scattered the proud in the conceit of their heart. He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich he hath sent empty away. He hath received Israel his servant, being mindful of his mercy. As he spoke to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever."

Here let me ask, Have Protestants ever had *generations* to fulfil this prophecy? or, even had they existed before the sixteenth century, would they, could they, have accomplished it—they who glory in derogating, by every possible manner, from her graces, her blessings, and her honours?

No, my friends, the Bible still triumphs in its veracity as to its every particle; Catholic generation after generation—before your Protestant progenitors were yet in the womb of time—in the long tract of innumerable days—permitted not one of them to steal away in silence, unhailed by the cheering sound of Mary; not a single dawn has ever gladdened the saints of God's Church, since its foundation to the present hour, that has been unsaluted by its multitudinous tongues, calling Mary *blessed*, in strict conformity to the laws of prophetic harmony, from which she can no more wander than can the stars in heaven from the course and order appointed to them by their great Creator. [Sensation.]

"For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

Yes, Mary! Mother of my divine Redeemer, for whose ineffable glory I am ready, at any time, to shed the

last drop of my blood, the Church still calls thee "blessed," with sentiments and feelings utterly incommunicable to the dark, to the cold, unelevated heart of a Calvinist. My reverend antagonist will not, of course, admit that sublime prediction to be daily and hourly accomplished in the Catholic Church, though I have placed a luminous body of such incontrovertible evidence before him, which might enable him to see it.

REV. J. CUMMING.—No, no!

MR. FRENCH.—But let us not leave the glorious *Magnificat* with that precipitate celerity which my learned friend so eagerly seems to wish for, in the writhing anguish of his heart, whilst I prove Mary "blessed."

"And his mercy is on them that fear him, from generation to generation." v. 50.

And so say we Catholics: *and his mercy is on them* that glory in the fulfilment of his predictions, by incessantly calling Mary "blessed."

"He hath shown strength with his arm, he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts."

Who are "the proud?" Why they who rise up against the loud voice of ages, that has taught the Christian to delight in the praise of Mary—those are the proud, the self-opinionated men, the self-exalted great ones, who elevate their proud crests against the Church of God, and consequently despise Mary, and deny her blessedness. I view, therefore, my friends, (and my learned antagonist, I trust, will condescendingly permit me to take my own view of Scripture prophecies) I view in this uninterruptedly resounded *Magnificat* at once a standing proof of the glories of the Catholic Church, and of the glories of Mary. Just as, in my conception of things, that

grand prophecy of Malachi is visibly and perpetually accomplished by the ever-during Church of Christ celebrating Mass, by so many thousands and tens of thousands of altars, erected over the whole world—just so is that grand prediction of Mary, that “all generations shall call her blessed,” yearly, daily, hourly, being accomplished in the Church of the living God. You see, therefore, my Protestant friends, the high state of exaltation to which the merits of Mary have raised her.

And here, gentlemen, having mentioned the word “merit,” give me leave to explain it, for I am aware it is one that is ill brooked by many, especially by the sons of Calvin. All merit, in the paths of Christian warfare, flows from Christ. This is a settled principle in the Catholic Church. The word used in the New Testament for the reward of our struggles in this world for the obtainment of the celestial palm, is, in Greek, *μισθος*, which signifies, “pay, stipend, wages of one hired.” We have, however, no merit to ourselves; but God is willing to accept our ignoble efforts in working out our salvation; he is willing to accept them as merits, though, in fact, all merit flows from grace, and grace alone. I should wish the doctrine to be set clearly before you. But, my friends, as I have explained it in a little composition of mine, which I sent some months ago to a Calvinistic friend, a man of learning and genius, whom I wished, if possible, to *uncalvinize*, I shall take the liberty of reading it aloud. I hope it will not offend my learned antagonist, if I tell him in verse, instead of doing it in prose, what we Catholics think of *good works*, what we think of the doctrine of *grace*, and chiefly what we think of the *merits* of the saints.

ON FAITH WITHOUT GOOD WORKS.

“What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?”—*St. James's Gen. Epist. ii. 14.*

“Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.”—*Id. 17.*

“ . . . And though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.”—*St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 2.*

“But in every nation he that feareth him and worketh justice, is acceptable to him.”—*Acts x. 35.*

“Be not deceived, God is not mocked! for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”—*St. Paul, Gal. vi. 7.*

“And I heard a voice from heaven saying to me, Write, blessed art the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their *works* do follow them.”—*Rev. xiv. 13.*

VERSES ON THE ABOVE TEXTS,

Sent to a Friend of the Calvinistic Creed.

Shorn of good works, the Christian tree lies dead:
Though Faith shoot forth fair blossoms from its head,
In vain the beauteous plant may seem to grow,
Unless sweet fruits of piety it show;
How bright soe'er the bloom of Faith may shine,
Death, inward death, consumes the sap divine.
Not each that cries out “Lord, O heavenly Lord,
By me believ'd, own'd, dreaded and adored!”
Shall find on Faith the beams of mercy play,
Upon the last, the great avenging day.
Unless true Faith with works of love shall glow,
True Faith itself shall prove his bitter foe.
Better, far better, to have never known
Celestial Faith, than trust to faith alone.
What though thy Faith, the gift of heavenly grace,
Could move vast mountains from their solid base,
Say, can its power, where sins and crimes control,
Wash the deep stains from off thy guilty soul?

Tw'as Luther first that impious dogma taught—

Man could be sav'd, though no good works he wrought,

By Faith alone ;—good works he taught were vain,

Nay, all infected with a mortal stain.

Proud Luther thus the ancient creed o'er-threw,

While to his banner guilty nations flew,
Who still the merit of good works disown,
And teach "Man justified by Faith alone."

Yet man, ev'n Luther own'd, might fall from grace,

And by foul sin all sanctity efface.

Not thus stern Calvin : he more impious far,
'Gainst old religion wag'd a deadlier war.

If Faith, he argues, can thus cleanse from sin,

And trust in Faith can make man pure within,

This trust in Faith should equally relate
To make man certain of his future state.

If prayer and trust make man of grace secure,
Then prayer and trust can make salvation sure.

Be man no more in clouds of tempest tost,
Grace once receiv'd, is never, never lost.

Though monster of pollution, foul and dark,
No mass of crime can quench th' ethereal spark,

Unburied, unextinguish'd grace still lives,
And crime on crime committed still forgives;

Away repentance with dissolving tears,
Faith dwells within, and knows nor doubts nor fears.

Nay more—the father's justice, he contends,
From sire to son inherited descends.

In a whole lineage, if but one be just,
All his descendants in his grace may trust ;

In a whole lineage, if one bad we find,
All his forefathers are to hell consigned.

Born in the *Covenant*, no sin can taint
The offspring, in his mother's womb, a saint ;

The font of Baptism is view'd with scorn,
Or us'd, but as a seal of grace inborn.

Such the new dogmas, such the shuddering creed,

Of Calvin's pure predestinated seed ;

Dogmas through Christendom untaught before ;

Oh ! how unlike the Apostolic lore !
With fear and trembling and laborious strife,

To struggle for the palm—*eternal* life.

To make thy lamp of Faith around thee shine,

Fed by good works that flow from grace divine ;

Good works that, flowing from celestial spring,

Yet please, as if our own, th' Almighty King.

This Faith taught Paul, with love seraphic fired.

This Faith th' Evangelists with pens inspired,

This Faith the Gospel breathes in every page,

This Faith the Church proclaims from age to age ;

This Faith alone th' immortal soul can save,
And rise triumphant o'er the gloomy grave.

Come then, stern combatant in Calvin's field.

Gird on the genuine, adamant shield,*

Faith,† deck'd with works that crown the man divine,

And through eternity resplendent shine !

Such, gentlemen, is our view of that intricate and difficult doctrine of grace. The Calvinists have peculiar notions concerning merits. Grace with them, once obtained, cannot be expunged by crime ; and this shuddering doctrine is grounded in their theology on the eleventh of St. Paul to the Romans, verse 29 : "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." There are many, I believe, in this assembly, who, whenever we mention the merits of saints, not understanding the meaning, are, as Protestants, naturally offended with it. But I would have them to know—for I have been particularly requested by a gentleman, who has taken great interest in this disputation, to explain what it means ; and I could not do it in a more pithy manner than by reading to you those verses I have written—but we would have you know, that of ourselves we are "dust and ashes," "vile rags," as the apostle has expressed it ; but that blessed Lord, from whom all grace flows, and without which grace, even by the little virtues of life, we are not pleasing in his eyes,—He is willing, having given us grace, which acts within us as long as we live a pure and unsullied life, and do not expel it, He is pleased to accept our efforts in working out our salvation, as so many merits. But, remember, it all hinges on the original infusion of grace into our souls by the Spirit, which so long as we cherish, our works are numbered in heaven, and

* "Putting on the breastplate of faith and love."—*St. Paul*, *Thess.* v. 8.

† "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three ; but the greatest of these is charity."—*St. Paul*, *1 Cor.* xiii. 13.

looked on as merits, and therefore it is said in Revelations—"Their works do follow them." Now they could not follow them if they were not merits in the sight of Jesus; they are now merits, inasmuch as they flow from the Fountain of all Grace.

And now, having explained this subject, a few words as to the meaning of the word "worship." "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool, for he is holy," or, "for *it* is holy;" for the Hebrew word will bear either interpretation. It has been variously translated—"it is holy," or "he is holy." Now, gentlemen, I have here to find fault—and I do not wish to take the learned gentleman by surprise—with the infidelity of the English translation. "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool." I maintain that the Hebrew is "worship *his* footstool," and I will prove it to you. "He is holy:" it may be translated "it is holy." In some books it is "it is holy." But that is very immaterial—we will not combat as to books. The Hebrew word will admit of either the feminine or masculine gender (they have no neuter), and, therefore, you may say "*he* is holy," or "*it* is holy."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—What is the Hebrew word?

Mr. FRENCH.—The Hebrew word is "hishtakhavoo;" that is, "to adore."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I mean the Hebrew word for *he*.

Mr. FRENCH.—It is included in "kadosh," "holy," or rather in the verb which is understood.

Rev. J. CUMMING, [several times.]—The Hebrew for *it*, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—I have told you it is included in the verb in the same manner as "*quia sanctum*" would mean "*quia sanctum est*." Here, in

that case, would be understood *hoc* or *illud*.

[JOHN KENDAL, Esq. here announced the expiration of the learned gentleman's hour, who was desirous of finishing the quotation. The Chairman then consulted the Rev. J. Cumming, who replied that "he did not mind it."]

Mr. FRENCH [to Rev. Mr. Cumming.]—I don't wish to take you at all unfairly; you may have more time. I only wish to finish this. [Mr. Cumming intimated his assent, and the learned gentleman proceeded.] Nay, more, even if the footstool were the temple, as their forced construction is, still would my argument hold good, inasmuch as David does not say, worship the footstool, or at the footstool, but worship the footstool, "*adore scabellum*," as Jerome has it; and Jerome, I maintain, was one of the most perfect Hebrew scholars that ever existed. Ask any Jew at the present day, and he will tell you that his translation is the finest production of any scholar. Jerome always translates it "adore his footstool." Now my object is to show you in the whole of this argumentation, that the word "adore" or "worship" is used for God indiscriminately, or angels, or inanimate beings. There was a veneration paid to inanimate things; a veneration different entirely from that which we call "Latria;" that is, the prostrate adoration of all the powers of our soul to the one only God.

[The learned gentleman then sat down.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—If ever, my Christian hearers, there was a speech of which the verdict might with the utmost confidence be pronounced, *De multis rebus et quibusdam aliis*, it is the speech of my learned and

most persevering opponent. He has first of all introduced to your attention the proprieties and the correctness of the translation of the Bible of King James; the authorized Bible of the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland, and of all the Dissenters before me. He has also introduced a discussion on the merits of the Apocrypha—which he says belongs to the original canon of Scripture, and which I shall show you has no pretensions to that rank, for one simple and satisfactory reason—that the writers themselves disclaim inspiration in the most express and significant manner. Not satisfied, however, with these remarks on the merits of the Apocrypha, the value of the English version, the forged liturgies of St. James, and the merits of Julian the Apostate, he wound up his eccentric and elaborate *farrago* in defence of saint worship, with telling us that the original Hebrew in Psalm xcix. 5, should be rendered “worship God’s *footstool!*” Now the Psalmist tells us that God’s footstool is “the *earth*,” and I therefore should not be surprised were I to see my learned antagonist bowing down and worshipping the earth, as one of the *Dii Minores*. I expect soon to hear that the Earth will be added to the roll of saints, and figure in the calendar, and we shall by-and-by have prayers offered up to Saint Earth as superstitious as those addressed to the Virgin.

At the close of his speech he defined to you the ideas of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of merits. And, as usual, he brought forward an extract from one of his poems, as an exposition illustrative of the Roman Catholic faith. Now when I want to get an exposition of the faith of the Church of England, I take one of the Thirty-nine

Articles. I do not have recourse to the poetic whims and crazy imaginations of any poet who may chance to come across my path, but I go at once to standard authority. Does my opponent dread the expositions of his *own* Church? He is surely not afraid of the canons of the Council of Trent? Yet I have not caught him referring to these canons, or to the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, for some time. Instead, he has constantly produced little bits of poetry, concocted under the inspiration of the muses, in which he has given his own lucid expositions of the Roman Catholic faith. As to his poem on human merits, all that I ask additional is, Does Mr. French’s poetry agree with the canons of the Council of Trent? To ascertain this, I shall just read to you the thirty-second canon, *De Justificatione*:—“If any shall say that the good works of a justified person are in such wise the gifts of God; that they are not also the good deserts of the justified person himself, or that a justified person does not truly deserve increase of grace and life eternal, and the attaining eternal life, provided he departs in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory, by the good works wrought by the grace of God,” &c.

Now, I leave my friend the problem of reconciling the poetry concocted under the guidance of the muses, and the canons concocted under the guidance of the popes and bishops and cardinals of the Church of Rome. I say, I leave the solution of this difficult problem in the hands of my ingenious friend. I venture to say that it will take him toil and time to make them harmoniously tally, or to enable him to give anything like a satisfactory exposition of the difference. I find, also, that, notwith-

standing all I said, he has again introduced Calvin, and seems still to imagine that Calvin is my Pope. I am to be brought, *per fas aut nefas*, to acknowledge Calvin, and to fall down and offer to him prayers something like those offered to saints and the Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome. For the tenth time I repeat, Calvin is not my Pope; Calvin's Institutes are not the confession of my faith. Though he were to consign Calvin, as he has done Augustine and Aquinas, to the depths of the ocean, my creed would still remain untouched and unscathed; imperishable as the God that gave it—immortal as the Bible that reveals it. I have nothing to do with Calvin; I appeal "to the Law and to the Testimony;" and if Calvin speak not according to that, I treat him with the utmost indifference.

My learned antagonist next classified me, in the exercise of his most extraordinary charity, with Julian the Apostate—in a word, with Infidels, Atheists, Socinians, Socialists, and Deists. I cannot charge myself with having used towards my opponent an opprobrious or an ungenerous word. I have spoken faithfully and truly respecting that baleful superstition, under the eclipse of which he has lost his view of "the Sun of Righteousness, the Lord Jesus;" but respecting my opponent I have spoken in terms the most endearing; and I have prayed (God can bear me witness)—I have prayed that his soul may be graciously enlightened, and that it may please God to lead him to the acknowledgment of the truth. I have never used one disrespectful term towards him, either in his presence or in his absence. Surely it does argue a rather *questionable* cause which requires to be backed up by personal reproaches, and

classifications of an opponent with Julian the Apostate, and Infidels, and others. I would only add, that had Julian the Apostate heard of the worship of Mary, and of the saints, he would have made greater havoc of Christianity. Had it been in his days, Christianity would not have lived so long, but must have perished, not only under the attacks, but under the scorn of the Atheists and Infidels of the time. My friend has spoken much about the *kind* of worship given to the Virgin, and that when he adores her it is by no means derogatory to the intercession of Christ. Now I hold in my hand a document, known to Mr. French, a volume of the Breviary of the Church of Rome, to which is added a service called the Office of the Blessed Virgin. To give you practical proof of the worship that is paid to Mary, I quote from this well-known document a part of the sermon of St. Bernard:—"For there is need of a mediator to the Mediator Christ, nor is there any other more useful to us than Mary. Why should human frailty tremble at approaching Mary? There is nothing austere or terrible in her."

It is necessary, you observe, that between Christ and us there should be a mediator, and that that mediator should be the Virgin Mary. It is taken from the sermon of St. Bernard the abbot. Lecture fifth: "In short, Mary has made all things to all, and by a most copious charity she made herself debtor to the wise and foolish. She opens the bosom of her mercy that all may receive of her fulness, the captive redemption," &c.

Here is language, you observe, surely beyond all due boundary and limit. I ask any honest and dispassionate inquirer, Does not this trench on the sacred prerogative of Christ? "In *him*," says the

apostle "all fulness dwells:" but here it is stated that in Mary "all fulness dwells," and that we are to receive that fulness from her.

Again: "Let us seek grace, and let us seek it through Mary."

Again: "We beseech thee, O Lord, to pardon the offences of thy servants, that we, who cannot please thee by our own doings, may be saved by the intercession of thy Son our Lord," p. 565.

I quote the words that follow as they are used and recognised in the Breviary by the Roman Catholic Church. I quote *Lectio* 8:—"But perhaps you fear also in Christ, the Divine Majesty, because, though he was made man, he was still God. Do you desire to have an advocate with him? Have recourse to Mary. I do not hesitate to say that she also will be heard for her own sake."

It appears from these documents there is a chasm, a blank, between Christ and us, and that that blank must be filled up by the intercession of *Mary*. Now I will show you, before I conclude this evening, that so far from there being a moral vacuum, or a chasm, between the Lord Jesus Christ and the poorest widow, or the meanest orphan that has not a home to dwell in, that he has come down to the lowest though sinless depths of our humanity—"sin only excepted"—that he has wrapped himself, as it were, in our sympathies, and steeped himself in our sorrows—that he has wept our tears and borne our sins—that "in all points he was tried like as we are;" "that we have not a high-priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but that "he was in all points tried like as we are, yet without sin." And therefore, "let us come with boldness to a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to

help us in time of need." I quote once more from another document in general use among Roman Catholics, called "The Glories of Mary," by Liguori, who was canonized, as the preface tells us, in 1816, by Pius VII.; and the sacred congregation of Rites, after a rigorous examination of this book, pronounced it faultless. Successive popes and cardinals lauded Liguori and his works, and set their solemn and infallible seals to the following blasphemies:—

"O Mother of God, hope of mankind, dispensatrix of the divine grace." p. 106.

"O Mary! my refuge, how often have I not rendered myself the slave of hell! you have broken my bonds, and snatched me from the hands of my enemies; but I dread falling again under their dominion, for they continually seek to carry off my soul, and flatter themselves it shall become their prey. Holy Virgin, defend me! protected by you, I am sure of victory; but grant that I may never forget to invoke you, especially during my last combat, the most terrible of all. Place then your holy name, with that of your divine Son, on my lips and in my heart; and grant, that expiring, while invoking Jesus and Mary, I may find myself at thy feet in heaven. Amen." p. 114.

"O Mary, our faithful mediatrix! Virgin full of grace! Ladder of Jacob! Gate of heaven! Treasury of divine grace! may all Christians honour you with all their hearts—to use the beautiful expression of St. Bernard, and cling to you with the utmost fidelity. Let us implore grace, but let us do so through you; in fine, let us present to God, through your sacred hands, all the prayers and good works in our power, if we desire that this our

incense may be acceptable to the Lord." p. 133.

"Mary is all my confidence; Mary is the foundation of my hope."

"Hear how the Holy Ghost makes Mary speak in the Canticles: 'I am the defence of those who recur to me; my mercy is to them an impregnable tower; and hence the Lord has established me a mediatrix of peace between him and sinners.' 'This powerful mediatrix,' says Cardinal Hugo, 'procures peace for those who are at war—by her, pardon is granted to the guilty, salvation to the lost, mercy to those who are in despair.'" p. 152.

"Father Justin assures us, that one sigh from Mary can do more for us with God than all the prayers of the saints united together: the devil himself acknowledged the same to St. Dominic, by the mouth of a possessed person."

"St. Germanus says to Mary, 'You, O holy Virgin, have over God the authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate of sinners.' St. Bridget heard the saints say to Mary, 'Queen of heaven! elect of the Lord! what is impossible to you?' To this corresponds a celebrated adage of a certain father: 'You, O holy Virgin, can effect by your prayers all that God can operate by his power.'" p. 141.

"O Mother of mercy, appease your Son! While on earth you occupied only a small portion of it; but now, elevated to the highest heavens, we regard you as the propitiation of all nations; grant us your prayers so desirable, so precious—prayers, holy Mother, which, in propitiating the Most High, will obtain us grace to expiate our sins, to practice virtue, to confound our enemies, and triumph over their designs. Amen." p. 196.

"We read in the Chronicles of St. Francis, that brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders, one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ, and the other white, at the top of which presided his blessed Mother. He observed, that many who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down; and on trying again, were equally unsuccessful, so that they never attained the summit; but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them!" pp. 180, 181.

Such is the monstrous idolatry in which neither popes nor cardinals, on solemn and inquisitorial search, could see any fault or flaw. Every Roman Catholic knows the book, and not a few before me possess it. I do ask, Is not such language derogatory to the glory, mediation, and intercession of the Son of God? And yet, all these extracts are taken from the writings of a saint who has been canonized in the Church of Rome, and in whose writings, I repeat, the Sacred Congregation of the Index could find nothing detrimental to the faith, piety, and morals of the faithful! Instead of replying by elaborate argument (as I might do), I quote the productions of my antagonist's Church—the recognised and authorized productions of his Church; and I do appeal to the judgments of you all, if I say not the truth when I affirm, that if ever dishonour, deep and dismal, was inflicted on the mediatorial character of the blessed Jesus, whom I worship, in whom is my sole trust, in whom I live, and in whom I hope to die, and from whom I expect all that can make me holy here and happy hereafter—if ever there was foul dishonour perpetrated and heaped upon that blessed

name, all this and worse is perpetrated in the vile and pestilential superstition contained in this volume. I do not hesitate to characterize it thus, because it trenches on the Lord of glory, whom I love. If you saw an individual in this country attempt to injure the sacredness of our throne, or tamper with the person of our Queen—if you saw the hand of some traitor put forth to tarnish her crown, or to tear it from her temples, there is not one in this assembly, either Protestant or Roman Catholic, who would not dash that hand aside, in order to vindicate his Queen, even though it were the hand of a brother, a father, or a friend. And thus is it in reference to Christ. I care not whose hand it is that is put forth to tarnish his royal crown and tamper with his glory; I feel it my sacred duty, as well as my great privilege, as far as in me lies, and as far as God's word permits me, to thrust aside that hand, and allow the glories of his priesthood, his righteousness, and his sacred mediatorial character, to stream down in one unbroken blaze upon dying sinners that need to be enlightened. [Strong sensation.]

Again, my friend objected, in the course of his speech, that I was quoting unauthentic documents; and he asked, "Why go to these formularies, and not to the articles and the canons?" I went to them at the outset for definitions; but naturally anxious to know what is the precise meaning which the Roman Church attaches to her creed, I now look at those formularies and documents which she commends to her worshippers and members. If I want to know the meaning which the Church of England attaches to her articles, I look into her Prayer-book, there to find in her services the full development of her principles. If I want to know the

meaning of the canons of the Council of Trent, I look into her authorised and recognized formularies, and find a full exposition of the meaning of them there. Therefore, I contend that these documents which I have read to you are a full, fair, and just development of those definitions which the Church of Rome has laid down; and to prove the accuracy of this, we need only read the canonization of the writers, and the illustrious sanction under which these idolatries appear.

The next remarks of my learned antagonist were in reference to the Liturgy of St. James. I told you that Cardinal Bona objected to the Liturgy of St. Peter—that the celebrated Dupin, one of the historians of his own Church, objects to the Liturgy of St. James, and declares that it never was composed by St. James, because it speaks of events subsequent (!) to the death of that apostle. I might here read again the quotations from Dupin, as they are full of conclusive argument; but time will not allow. It is enough to say that he justly disputes its being composed by St. James, not only on account of allusions to circumstances after his death, and its containing contradictory language, but for other and more cogent reasons. My opponent quoted the apostle Paul, beseeching the Ephesians and Colossians to pray for him. I told him, again and again, with marked reiteration, that if I ask you to pray for him, or you to pray for one another, it is correct; and that it is one thing for a saint on earth to ask another saint on earth to pray for him; but that it is a totally different thing (and I wish to make this distinction quite clear to my opponent) for one on earth to pray to another in heaven. If Paul had been a Roman Catholic, he would have ad-

dressed the church in heaven:—"Pray for me;" but being inspired by the spirit of Protestantism, he asked his audience to pray for him.

Again, I find my friend contradicts my statement, that his Church holds that the saints of the Old Testament were *in limbo* until the resurrection of Christ. This is stated in the Douay Bible. Even the Church of Rome will not hold it expedient for the faithful to pray to the saints suffering in purgatory, to pray—

MR. FRENCH.—No, no. I did not.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I stated that, on your own principles, it is illegitimate to quote from the Old Testament in favour of prayers to saints, for all the saints were *in limbo* till the resurrection. You contended it was legitimate [turning to Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—*Legitimate* or *illegitimate*, which did you say?

REV. J. CUMMING.—*Legitimate*.

MR. FRENCH.—Very well.

REV. J. CUMMING [in continuation]. Observe then: that is all I want. If I expressed myself wrong, I am sorry for it. In asserting this, my learned friend casts the illustrious Cardinal Bellarmine overboard, for he most plainly declares it to be illegitimate. [Laughter.] We are advancing—we have seen him cast his favourite Aquinas overboard, next the illustrious St. Jerome—next Augustine, and then Delahogue; in the same admirable and sweeping march over ruined doctors, he brushed away the eighty folio volumes of the Bollandists, and now, at length, he turns adrift the illustrious Bellarmine! Really I have stronger hopes still of the final conversion of my learned and ingenious opponent. I expect that at length he will discountenance the whole Roman faith and cast Pope Pius' Creed overboard also. I cannot, I

may add, as he wishes again and again, concede the term *Catholic* to his church. I have given him the most courteous term, that of *Roman Catholic*. He would not let me use terms which I deem fittest; and in delicacy to his feelings I have forborne to use one epithet which was harsh, imperious, or severe.

My friend next discussed the merits of the Protestant Bible, and in doing so, used expressions neither the most happy nor correct. Dr. Doyle pronounced the Protestant version "a noble version." Now I have read portions of it in the Hebrew, and the whole of the New Testament in Greek, over and over again; and I am prepared to take, verse by verse, in Hebrew and in Greek, and to show that our version is the most just and accurate version that was ever made; and I am prepared to prove that every passage that has been altered in the Douay version for the last fifteen or twenty years has been an approximation to the translation of the *Protestant Bible*: and that in the version of Dr. Murray, in many of its passages, the Roman translators have adopted the precise translation which the Protestant translators adopted before them, thus attesting its genuineness and validity. If the production of the Church of Rome be a faithful version, why is it that the longer it lives, the nearer it comes to our Protestant version? The assertion that our version is "abomination," comes with a monstrous bad grace from my friend, because he is aware that his own doctors and bishops must believe it to be the best, seeing they regard their own as approaching perfection in the ratio in which theirs approximates to ours. And were I to enter on the merits of the Romish version—which I allow contains much that

is good, but, at the same time, some of the worst and most odious paraphrases ever palmed upon the world—were I to submit a critical disquisition on the comparative merits of the two versions of Scripture, it were easy to point out the corrupt and wilfully mutilated character of the translation contained in the Douay Bible. But I must take up the next quotation which my opponent quoted, which was from the book of Tobias. Before he read it he made some preliminary remarks as to Protestants not having the whole Bible. Now I contend that we have the **WHOLE** Bible—"the **WHOLE** Bible, and nothing but the Bible"—when we hold this sacred book in our hands. And to show you that the books to which my opponent referred—viz. Tobias, and first and second of Maccabees, and Baruk, and Esdras, and other apocryphal books—have no claim to be enumerated in the sacred canon, I shall give you the following facts. Let me add, *en passant*, I might quote from the Apocrypha, to show that the Invocation of Saints is by no means countenanced even there.

I observe, First—*The Apocrypha was never written in the Hebrew tongue, in which the whole of the Old Testament was written.* Secondly—*It was never recognised by the Jews, to whom were committed the oracles of God.* Thirdly—*It is not quoted in the catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, in the pages of the celebrated Jewish historian, Josephus, who ought to have known his own canon.* In the fourth place—*That our Lord and the Apostles never quote from the Apocrypha, and yet they quote from almost every other book of the Old Testament.* In the fifth place, I hold in my hand the Catalogues of the Canonical Books given by St. Jerome and others of the fathers, who have excluded from

their catalogues at least nine-tenths of these very books which the Roman Catholic Church claims to belong to the sacred canon. But what is the best evidence, after all, whether the Apocrypha belongs or belongs not to the Bible? Why surely, the testimony of the writers themselves! My friend has referred me to the Book of Maccabees. I go to it. I quote from fifteenth chapter of the Second Book of Maccabees, verses 38, 39 :—"I also will here make an end of my narration, which, if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired; but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."

Conceive an inspired writer making use of such phraseology! Now conceive St. Paul asking pardon for errors in the Epistle to the Hebrews; or St. Peter asking pardon for those in his two epistles; and then you will at once perceive that the writers were far more honest than the Church which claims them. They disclaim, you see, all claims to inspiration. Nay, if my friend is prepared to adopt part or all of the Apocrypha—and I will give him much more on this when we come to a subject for which I long much, the Rule of Faith—he must add to the creed of his Church a new article, justificatory of *suicide*! as it is applauded in one of the books of the Apocrypha. It is here recorded in the Second Book of Maccabees, xiv. 41: "Now, as the multitude sought to rush into his house and to break open the door, and to set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, he struck himself with his sword, choosing to die **NOBLY** rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked and to suffer abuses unbecoming his noble birth."

Here there is a sanction given, indirectly, but most decidedly, to the practice of suicide. The rest of

the quotations of my antagonist from sacred Scripture have really nothing to do with the subject. He quoted Psalm xxxiv. 7: "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them;" *ergo*, says he, you are to pray to angels! Now I can see no connexion between the premises and conclusion. I am so blind as to see none. He next quoted Psalm xci. 11: "For he shall give his angels charge over thee." Now you will recollect that *Salan* also quoted that text to our Lord when he was tempted in the wilderness. He quoted it wrong, for he left out the path of duty, "to keep thee in all thy ways." I will not say now, though I have the opportunity, that my learned friend has been following a *very, very* bad example; but certainly, to say the least, he has had recourse to a very extraordinary process for proving, that because they have charge over us, it follows that we are to worship them. It was said of our Lord, "the angels have charge of thee," and therefore, according to my learned antagonist's patent and peculiar logic, the inference ought most undoubtedly to be, that our Lord ought to worship the angels; for the prediction is not in reference to us, but to Christ. But if the text respected us, and I admit it is recorded that "angels are ministering servants to us," it does not follow that we are to pray to them.

We next had the passage which alludes to "the seven spirits which are before the throne," (in Revelations i. 4.) and you may recollect he called particular attention to it. He said, "the seven spirits" must mean *angelic spirits* before the throne. Now, suppose it did mean so, I see not the least jot or tittle of evidence in favour of worshipping them. This text from the

Apocalypse is, "Grace and peace from the seven spirits which are before the throne;" but this proves not that you are to worship them. But let me, once for all, shut my friend's mouth on this subject by a quotation from "the glorious Augustine," his great and admired favourite; and I am sure that if St. Augustine pronounces one way on the seven spirits, and my friend another, he will not fail to give Augustine another slap for daring to contradict him in his unanimous interpretations of Scripture. Augustine says:—"Which Holy Spirit is commended to us in the Scriptures by the number *seven*, or the *seven-fold number*, as well in Isaiah as in the *Apocalypse*, where the seven spirits are most evidently set forth."—*Expos. of Psalms*. cl. tom. iv. p. 1693.

And then I quote——

Mr. FRENCH [to the Catholic Chairman, John Kendal, Esq.]—The arrangement was, that we should not quote from the fathers to-night.

[JOHN KENDAL, Esq. then intimated the same to GEORGE FINCH, Esq., the Protestant Chairman, who forthwith reminded Mr. Cumming of a pledge he had entered into on the previous evening, which he appeared to have forgotten.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I am not to quote, I find, from the fathers to-night!

Mr. FRENCH.—But you have done it; it does not matter.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I thought it would be more satisfactory than any exposition of my own; and really, recollecting no such pledge, I gave the quotation. I can confirm it by another quotation from another distinguished father, Gregory Nazienzen:—"The precious spirits were called seven. For Isaiah, I think, was accustomed to call the operations of the Spirit, spirits."—*Forty-first Oration*, p. 733.

Now it seems I have satisfied him from the Fathers that "the seven spirits" mean the one Holy Spirit, as we read that there are seven churches to represent the whole Church. Our Lord is also represented with seven eyes, to show his perfect wisdom. The number seven, in fact, is received and recognised as "the symbol of perfection." Hence the seven spirits are descriptive of the Holy Spirit. These parallel passages most distinctly show—unless I am to reject them, and thus to imitate the example of my learned opponent, who casts Augustine overboard when he offends him—these passages show that the seven spirits are the Holy Spirit, and not angels or saints before the throne. The next passage he quoted was Apocalypse viii. 3:—"Another angel stood before the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer up the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which is before the throne of God." (*Douay Bible*.) Now, said he, here is a proof, at once, that worship is to be given to angels. Now, observe, in the first place, it is not asserted in the passage, that you are to pray to this or any other angel. But let that go. In the next place, can we show who was the angel with the golden censer? This question is solved in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ix. 24:—"For Jesus is not entered into the Holies made with hands, the pattern of the true, but into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us." The Holiest of all had the golden censer. (Heb. ix. 4, *Douay version*.) Christ is also called "the Angel of the Covenant," the Angel Jehovah, as I explained again and again, last Tuesday evening. In the next place, if it be one of the angels merely that is here mentioned,

then it must follow that he was invested with omnipresence and omnipotence, being able to present the prayers of *all* saints; *all* the prayers of the Virgin; *all* the prayers of Peter; *all* the ten thousand prayers of ten thousand saints, scattered throughout the whole world, and existent in every age. Can he have been finite to have done this? No; he must have been infinite in power to have presented the prayers of "all saints," from the Fall down to the close of the Gospel history. And therefore the very act in which the angel is engaged before God, at the altar, and with the golden censer, is a fair demonstration to me, that he must be the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel Jehovah, Jesus Christ, "God over all, blessed for ever."

The next reference made was to the words, "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Now, I showed you before that the context shows the intimation *to have been conveyed* to these angels of the salvation and penitence of the sinner. You will find that it is not stated in the passage, that the moment the lost sheep was found, the angels rejoiced. But it is said it was God the Father who first rejoiced, and afterwards we read of the angels rejoicing. I therefore contend that God the Father rejoices over the restitution of the lost; that God the Son, when he sees the travail of his soul, is satisfied; and that the Holy Spirit is glad when another sinner is added to the company of the blest, and that then the tidings circulate through heaven, and angels are also bidden to rejoice. But it is a most extraordinary logic that would infer from this passage a proof of the point under discussion, namely, the propriety of the invocation or worship of angels. There is not one

particle here about the worship of angels.—My learned friend next related a chapter of his own transactions. He was pleased to go to a Bible meeting, and to interrupt a dissenting minister at the meeting, who told the audience that “angels rejoiced over the circulation of the Bible.” If the orator in question chose to say so, and to perpetrate such an “orientalism,” I am surely not to blame for it. Christianity is not answerable for all that men say. Were I the superior of the minister who said so, I would bring him to book. Neither he nor others are my rule of faith; the oracles of the living God alone are binding on me.

We next had a disquisition upon the merits of the Jesuits and other Papal missionaries who had gone to China. I could give you startling facts about these gentlemen, if time only permitted. He talks about the priests of the Church of Rome rushing out by storm and calm, and by night and day, to the assistance of persons in sickness and disease, and that they will attend at any hour you wish them to come. I can solemnly declare, that if word were sent me from a dying widow or orphan, at any hour of the night or day, I would go and pray with and solace them, whatever the personal inconvenience, though I must confess I cannot promise either of them a *viaticum* to heaven. [Laughter.] And I believe there is not a Protestant minister before me who would not deem it his duty, no less than his privilege, to go in similar circumstances, whether he be a Church-of-England man, or Baptist, or a Wesleyan; for he is unworthy the name of a minister of the Gospel if he will not go forth when God’s providence calls him, and when God’s grace may enable him.

Again: my friend referred to the ancient liturgies, accompanied with

other remarks and ideas, which exist nowhere on the face of the earth, and in nobody’s judgment, except in his own wild fancy, which, like Jerome’s, as I read you from Dupin, seems to be rather warmly inclined to “orientalism” and oratory to-night. I shall not, therefore, touch them. In reference to the worship of the Virgin Mary, on which I have already made some remarks, I shall lay before you some scriptural passages most surely rather opposed to it. Luke i. 16:—“My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit rejoiceth in God my Saviour.” She did not say, I am his “wife,” I am “Queen of Heaven,” I am the “Spouse of the Holy Spirit;” but Mary felt her position the loftiest when she became an humble worshipper of Christ, and said, “My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit rejoiceth in God MY SAVIOUR.” My opponent quoted, with seeming triumph, the succeeding passage, in which it is said, “Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.” Every Protestant in the Church of England reads these words in the Prayer-book every Sunday evening; and every Protestant, when he reads them in the Bible, admits them to be chaste and just. But then every Protestant feels that the inference my opponent draws from the words is most extravagant. He says these words, “all generations shall call me *blessed*,” mean, “all generations are to give me worship,” as is expounded in the “Sacred Heart,” which my Roman Catholic auditors can refer to at home. My friend complained of my figurative language. Who is there that now uses oriental licences? Surely it is the man who says that these words, “All generations shall call me blessed,” mean, “You shall offer me *hyper-doulian* adoration,” such as is recommended in Liguori. I refer

to Matthew v. 3, and we find there others blessed as well as the Virgin. "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." If my opponent's logic is good, and "blessed" means worthy of worship, we find in these words reason for falling down and worshipping the "*peace-makers*," them that "mourn," or them that are "persecuted for righteousness' sake." But mark the disastrous consequences it necessarily involves. My friend says, "All generations shall call me blessed," means, "all generations shall worship me;" and "blessed art thou among women," proves that she is to have the worship of *hyper-doulia*. Pray follow me to the book of Judges, v. 23 :—"Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty. BLESSED ABOVE WOMEN SHALL Jael, THE WIFE OF HEBER THE KENITE, BE; blessed shall she be ABOVE women in the tent." Now if Mary being pronounced "blessed among women" implies that Mary is to be worshipped, *à fortiori*, Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, ought to be worshipped, for "BLESSED shall she be ABOVE women;" and therefore I would recommend the Church of Rome, in these reforming times, in times when all sorts of corruptions may be removed, to remove Mary from the calendar, and, with more consistency and scriptural force,

insert Jael in her room and niche. It will be at least a step nearer to the Bible, though it falls infinitely short of it.

In the next place, to show you how little precedent or encouragement for worship to be given to Mary is to be gathered from the statement of our Lord, I will read Luke xi. 27 :—"And it came to pass as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked." But he said, "*Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.*" In other words, our Lord said to those who, according to the Roman Catholic superstition, were inclined to give homage to Mary, "Yea, rather blessed are they who hear the word of God and do it." And, therefore, I pronounce every Protestant in this assembly who hears the word of God and does it, more blessed than the Virgin; I pronounce every Roman Catholic who does so, more blessed than the Virgin; and if more can be said, I should say that "she was more *blessed* (according to a quotation which I might bring from the fathers) for having *believed in Christ*, than for having been the mother of Christ." Again, in John ii., at the turning water into wine, I find our Lord saying, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" You observe, this is language as it is recorded, not of disrespect, I admit, but still language which gives not the least foundation for the *hyper-doulia* given to the Virgin in the Church of Rome. Again; there is a passage in St. Augustine on that very question; but my friend has forbidden me to read the fathers this evening.

MR. FRENCH.—You can do what you like.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Augustine

says, "It is written in the Gospel, that when the mother and brethren of Christ, that is, his relations after the flesh, were announced to him, and waited without, he answered, 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?' and, pointing to his disciples, he said, 'These are my brethren; and whosoever shall perform the will of my Father, he is my brother, and mother, and sister.' What else did he teach us by this, but that we should prefer our spiritual to our carnal relationship? MARY THEREFORE WAS MORE BLESSED IN ADOPTING THE FAITH OF CHRIST THAN CONCEIVING HIS FLESH; for when some one said to him, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee,' he answered, 'Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.' Thus, also, *Mary's maternal relationship would have profited Mary nothing, if she had not borne Christ more blessedly in her heart than in her flesh.*"—*Upon Holy Virginity*, ch. iii. Jar. 6, p. 342.

That is the testimony of St. Augustine; "more *blessed* in believing the testimony of Christ than in conceiving his flesh." There is salvation in no other name but that exalted name, the name of Christ Jesus, at which every knee shall bow. And to show you the high privileges with which Christ has invested us, we read:—"Let us therefore come with boldness to a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help us, in time of need." "Because ye are the sons of God; God hath sent forth the spirit of adoption into your hearts, saying, Abba, Father." Let me add, in conclusion, that there is no reason in the world why we should have recourse to Mary's mediation or intercession; for, our Lord being God and man, we contend that, in virtue of his Godhead, he lays his right hand on the throne;

and in virtue of his perfect humanity, he lays his left hand on the poorest and most abject of the children of men, thereby bringing together earth and heaven, men and God. He is Job's perfect "Daysman" between God and us. He is so high that the loftiest archangel is not beyond his control, and yet he comes down so low that the poorest orphan and the humblest widow may share in his sympathy and love. Whilst he listens to the archangel's song, offering to him the tribute of adoring homage, let it never be forgotten that he hears the humblest orphan's prayer. In the natural world there are the telescope and the microscope. Now the Roman Catholic Church allows the use of the telescope, to show you the far distant and mighty works in which Christ is employed. She withholds from you the microscope, to enable you to see minute things the objects of his care, and to see that, amid all his greatness and amid all his glory, he nevertheless condescends to the lowliest creature upon earth. Whilst, in the natural world, he weaves the gossamer wing of the insect, and adorns the violet with tints of loveliness, he also wields worlds in their orbits. While he listens to the prayers of the afflicted, and the sighs of the widow and the orphan, he also receives the anthem peal of worshipping cherubim. The least and the loftiest are alike under his cognizance. Look by faith at God in NATURE, and you cannot see him, you cannot reach him, he is shrouded in almost impenetrable darkness; look at God in the LAW, and you dare not approach him, he is "a consuming fire;" but look at God in the countenance of Christ, through his mediatorial work, and there you find him Immanuel, God with us. In heaven he "appears for us:" as it is stated in the language of the

Book of Revelations, "I saw a lamb, as it were *newly* slain," the marks of death and crucifixion still being visible about him. We may, therefore, well say of Christ, what a great poet makes Antony say of Cæsar, when he pointed to the wounds that had been inflicted on the emperor's body—"Show you sweet Cæsar's wounds, poor dumb mouths." So those dumb mouths, which Christ has borne into his Father's presence, have each "a tongue in them," and plead with piercing and prevailing eloquence for all who come unto God through him. What can injure us if Christ be our advocate? Can sin? "His blood cleanses from all sin." Can the law? "It is magnified." Can Satan? He is "bruised under our feet, and fallen like lightning from heaven." "If God is for us, who can be against us?" Who can condemn? it is God that justifieth. Moreover, it is the especial office of Christ to plead for us. It is the office of the law to condemn; it is the office of Satan to accuse; but it is the office of Christ to intercede and to plead for us. And, according to the quotation made also by my learned opponent, "Christ is our *advocate*, not our *petitioner*." My opponent knows, the office of the advocate is to make clear the law of a case, to make patent all the claims of a case. If Christ is the advocate, whom besides want we? and who can doubt but that every sinner who goes by faith to Christ shall have a verdict of acquittal?

Christ is represented as the husband of his Church. Now what would you think of a wife being so afraid of her husband that she dare not ask for money for domestic purposes, and for her family, unless by the intervention of a neighbour? You would say, This cannot be the husband, or she cannot be the wife. But Christ is the husband, and his

spouse is his Church; and therefore the wife may go with boldness to the husband without troubling saints, and ask for grace to help her in her time of need. You are aware of this, that by the law of the country, when a man marries a wife, the husband becomes responsible for all her debts—it is the law of the land, that the husband becomes responsible for all her debts. Now let me tell you, my dear Roman Catholic friends, that you have only to go and take Christ, by faith, as your spiritual husband, your only husband, to whom alone you will render soul obedience and worship, and He will be answerable for all your past debts; He will cancel them with his blood; yea, he will nail the hand-writing to the cross: and rest assured, with such a husband, "neither death nor life, nor principalities nor powers shall be able to separate you from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Again; Christ is called "the Head," and we are called "the members." Now if my little finger is injured, the sensation is immediately carried to the brain, and all the members of the body sympathize with it. It is so with Christ the head of the Church, and the members, who are believers. If the weakest and the poorest member suffer, that suffering is carried to heaven, and Christ sympathizes with his suffering member. I might show you many other passages of a similar nature. You have in the Lord Christ Jesus a perfect Mediator, a Mediator acceptable to the Father, a Mediator possessed of infinite and boundless love. And if you wish to know what is the sight of God, you may realize that wish by seeking him in Christ. I will refer you to a passage in Exodus, xxxiv. 6. Moses said unto God, "Show me thy glory;" and

God instantly replied, "Get thee up into the rock, and I will make all my glory to pass before thee." Now remember, the apostle says that "rock was Christ Jesus." Now I am going to tell you, my Roman Catholic friends, what a sight you may see by faith, if you will turn saints aside. Take Christ as your only "rock," your only advocate, your only intercessor. Moses went into the "rock," and the Lord passed before him, and "proclaimed the LORD the LORD God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin."

Now only mark what you can learn from this, if you only lean on Christ, and trust in him! The name of God is Jehovah; he who creates something out of nothing, a clean heart where there is none. But you may say, I am a guilty and a wicked sinner. Then the next sight which Moses saw, was the Lord God, *El*, the *strong* God, the God of infinite power and might, the God who can "change the heart of stone into a heart of flesh." If you say, I am a sinner, I am afraid to go near him, my answer is, That in Christ, by faith, he is "merciful;" the meaning of which is, he is the God who forgives sin, because in Christ he is "merciful." And if the Roman Catholic should still say, "Oh, but I have nothing to give him for his mercy, nothing to give him in return," then the next character in his name is that he is "gracious;" he gives gratuitously, "without money and without price." If you should say, I have sinned ten, twenty, thirty, forty, seventy years, the answer I make is, That he is "long-suffering," and will bear with you long, and will not be angry

with you for ever. If you say, "But I fear my sins are so many, that I have exhausted God's mercy," the answer is, He is "abundant in goodness and in truth." You may say, "But surely, after five thousand years of the world have rolled by, God's mercy must be exhausted, and there is none remaining for me;" the answer is, "He keepeth mercy for thousand generations." If you should say, "I have been guilty of original sin, of actual sin, of sin in thought, word, and deed," the next feature in his character, which is laid before you, is "forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin," *i. e.* all sorts and kinds of sin and of wickedness. Now this is just the very God which sinners want; this is the God, my friends, without whom we cannot live, or attain to final everlasting happiness. Now the question is, *Where* are we to find this God? Is it through *Mary*? No. Is it through Paul? No. Is it through his distinguished and illustrious saints? No; it is alone where Moses saw him, in the "Rock," and that rock, my friends, is CHRIST. And rest assured, if you will go to God by faith through Christ, you will find in that God every mercy and every blessing of which you stand in need, both for time and for eternity; and oh! remember this glorious truth, he is "able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him." "Christ is able to save to the uttermost." Tell me the limits of uttermost. Is it not infinitude itself; without beginning, without end; without bound or circumscription? Now, whom is he able to save to the uttermost? "Those who come unto God." Is it through *Mary*? Not a word about it.

Mr. FRENCH inquired for the reference.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I am quoting from Hebrews vii. 25. Is it those who come unto him through Peter, or Paul, or James? Not a word about these: "He is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God through HIM," (Christ.) Let me add, that sin is a tremendous gulf between earth and heaven. Now Christ Jesus is the pathway; he calls himself "the way, the truth, and the life;" he is the plank placed across that gulf; the one end of the pathway, being his Godhead, is at the foot of the eternal throne; the other end, being his humanity, completely spans the gulf, and reaches mankind; so that the thief hanging on the cross, should he by faith enter on that pathway, will be borne onward and upward until he reaches the bosom of his Father and his God. "Seeing that Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us." My friends, he ever intercedeth for us, and therefore the aid of saints cannot be necessary, because if I go to the Father (let me call the special attention of my Roman Catholic friends to this), because if I go to the Father (I quote from your own Bible, the Douay), "whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, I will do it, and the Father shall be glorified." Now mark the safety of Protestantism. You *may* be wrong; nay, if my reasoning be correct, you *must* be wrong; but even on your own principles, we Protestants are safe, because Christ is able to "save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him." Again: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, I will do it." And, therefore, we Protestants, who ask the Father in the name of Christ, must be right. And if ever you should need a passage to encourage you in the hour of trial, read in Ephesians, iii. 18:

"For through him we have access by one Spirit to the Father." You observe, there is no need of saints between us and Christ; in Christ we have "boldness." The literal translation is, "freedom of speech, the utterance of ideas in confidence;" and the apostle adds, "Because we have such an High-priest, let us come boldly to the throne of grace to find mercy, and to seek grace to help us in the time of need."

Again: we read, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." And again: (I address it to my Roman Catholic friends) "We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." When you want an intercessor, have recourse to no other, for it is stated, "through Him we have boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus. Ye have not received the spirit of bondage, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Oh, take with you, my dear friends, these words. Turn to the Lord, and not to Mary; cleave to the everlasting Creator, and not to the dying creature. "He that seeketh, shall find me; to him that knocketh, it shall be opened." "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give the Spirit to them that ask him!" Remember, you are all responsible before witnessing heaven, for the reception or rejection of these truths. As I told you before, "we shall all stand at the judgment bar of Christ."

And if, my friends, notwithstanding the light of Scripture which you have received, you persist in leaning on "broken reeds" and drinking from "broken cisterns," in having recourse to Mary and ten thousand other saints, you will

most inevitably perish. You may go to God by faith, I assure you, with no other intervention than Christ:—"For ye are not come unto the mount that might not be touched, and that burned with fire, nor into blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words, which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more. But ye are come unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel."—*Heb. xii. 18.*

I implore, you therefore, by the mercy of God, despite what your Church, your priests, or your popes may say, to have recourse solely to the doctrines of the sacred oracles. If your Church speak at all contrary to that sacred book, it is because "there is no truth in it."

Here the loud voice of a Catholic was raised at the extremity of the room to the following boisterous effect:—"It *does* not; it never will do;" upon which the reverend gentleman repeated the climax of his speech with greater emphasis than before. Both the Chairmen rose to order. One gentleman insisted that the person so dissenting should give up his admission ticket, upon which

Mr. FRENCH rose, and addressing the audience, said—I am really sorry that any Catholic should so far forget himself. The Protestants conduct themselves, I must say, with great propriety, with but very

few exceptions. There have been some, but not any so violent as that.

[After the lapse of a few moments the learned gentleman (on the restoration of attention) began his second address.]

Mr. FRENCH.—My learned opponent has been most amusingly fluttering about for the last half-hour, to use his own expression, as it were, "on the light wing of the gossamer;" but, in his usual manner, has rambled far, far away from the field of argument. I however, shall not follow his example. No, my friends, despising the vain thing called the gossamer, I shall dart at once on the wings of the eagle into the far distant regions of antiquity; and lighting at the feet of a true disciple of the apostles, the blessed Irenæus, who flourished in the year of our Lord 177, *of him* inquire, whether Mary may with just propriety be called our *advocate* or not. Now listen to his words:

"And as Eve was seduced to fly from God, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey him, that she might become *the advocate* of her that had fallen."—*St. Irenæ. adv. Hæres. l. v. 2—19, p. 316.* Edit. Benedict. Paris, 1710.

Really, my friends, my eagle, you must acknowledge, has conducted me on triumphant wing through the space of ages! What will my learned friend now say in answer to this glorious evidence? The best shift I could recommend to my baffled foe would be, to cry out most lustily, "Why, that said Irenæus was a rank Papist, or he never would have called Mary *our advocate*." [Laughter.] My antagonist asserts that it is superstitious, that it is idolatrous so to call her. Of course, he means to assert that it is something novel in Christianity, and of no ancient date. Does the

learned gentleman mean seriously to maintain, that the year of our Lord 177 is not an ancient date? And if he acknowledge it to be ancient, with what front will the reverend gentleman continue henceforward to laugh the Catholic to scorn for calling Mary *our advocate*, when one of the earliest of those very fathers whom, when occasion suits, the reverend gentleman himself quotes as corroborative testimonies in his own cause, positively calls her by that very name, against which he has been so violently storming for this long time past, to my no small astonishment, but to my infinite delight, whilst I was silently collecting all the strength of that irresistible thunderbolt from the archives of antiquity, by which my antagonist in argument now lies prostrate at my feet. Yes, Mary being thus clearly proved by Irenæus in the year 177 to be *our advocate*, who will listen to my reverend antagonist in the nineteenth century, furiously and tempestuously vociferating that she is not?

Thus you see, gentlemen, there is nothing like darting on the wings of an eagle, when one wishes to arrive swiftly at the place of destination. At all events my metaphorical friend will long remember the luckless introduction of his *gossamer* into a discussion of this kind; never can the name of that *genus volatile* be mentioned hereafter in the learned gentleman's presence, without calling to his mind, by association of ideas, *the eagle and Irenæus!*

To come now to my learned opponent's general train of reasoning, especially in his allusions to Scripture. The argumentative way of proceeding on the part of my learned friend would have been, to prove that in some age, some distant age, prayers were not offered up by the

Church of God. But instead of doing that, he gives us his own arbitrary *ipse dixit*s and arbitrary declamation on the meaning of the Gospel, where, even in the most figurative parts, whether apocryphal or apocalyptic, he has a most ready explanation, and pours it forth in the most didactic and imperious manner. But I at once deny his interpretation. I deny that those angels which were worshipped by Isaac and others—I deny that they were the Lord God. I maintain most strenuously that they were real angels. And at all events, if they were not angels, when Isaac paid them the devotion and adoration which is mentioned in Scripture, I affirm that he was under a delusion at least, and that, even if it was God, he thought it was an angel. The learned gentleman never can contradict, and I could logically establish my position by the pages of the Gospel, that it was lawful to venerate angels; and I will prove it most circumstantially and most clearly in what I have prepared to lay before you this evening. Before I go on, however, I am determined to notice those disingenuous proofs which my friend has collected from the pages of the Testament. With respect to the book of Maccabees, I maintained that it was canonical, because it was settled by the fathers of the Council of Carthage between the years 300 and 400. It was then that those books were settled. From that time down to the period of the Reformation they were uniformly received by the whole Christian world, as comprehending and containing the authentic Bible. At the time of the Reformation the doctrine of Purgatory incurred dislike and was expunged, about the reign of the eighth Henry. And what are the arguments by which the

learned gentleman wishes to perpetuate and ratify the expunging of the book of Maccabees? Observe how weak and indefensible they are! One appears to be because the author excuses himself as to his impoverished style; he says he has "done his utmost." Well! and did not St. Paul, talking of his own writings, declare that some things were of his own, and not inspired? Did he not at other times say, "I am rude in speech," that is unskilled in the minutiae and elegances of language? My learned friend well knows that the word *rudis* in Latin signifies unskilled; and what is that but a downright apology for inelegance of language and style? And does Maccabæus say more? And if he does not say that the subject was under inspiration, he at least says nothing to invalidate its worth. But who would ever wipe away a book which has been received so long without murmuring, settled by an early Council, merely in consequence of a few observations of this kind? If so, then let us reject the Gospel of St. Luke, for he says, "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Now I most firmly believe every tittle of this book of the Gospel written by St. Luke to be divinely inspired; but if I am to give way to his train of reasoning, I must say that it is not inspired, and that most clearly so, by reason

of his saying, "It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus;" instead of saying, "It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost," &c. &c. I say, if we are to adopt this human kind of reasoning, if we are not to receive the authentic sanction of age after age, from the time of the Council of Carthage till now, then we must expunge this book from the creed of a Christian land. Nay, even the Song of Solomon, if we are to judge in this way with the eyes of the natural understanding, must also be expunged; and if you were to appeal to the Christians of the whole universe, and to ask them whether they would even have suspected them to be inspired, they would answer, if they spoke truth, No, they never could, unless they knew it from the authority of the church? What church? what church? The Calvinistic Church?—it was never heard of! The Lutheran?—it was never heard of! The Anabaptist?—it was never heard of! The Society of Friends?—they were never heard of! No; the CATHOLIC CHURCH settled its character, and handed down that book to posterity, otherwise they would not have known that it was inspired. And there is not a candid man in this assembly, if he were to take it up and consider the expressions therein used, that would affirm, unless he had the guide and the authority of the church, that it was divinely inspired. I say, therefore, it is a most unfair and uncandid way of thus defacing the completeness of the Bible, and of defrauding—deliberately, wickedly, impiously defrauding the British nation of that solid food, immutable and eternal.

Another observation I have to make, before I go to the subject-

matter of discussion, is with regard to the learned gentleman's attempting to defend the Church of England Bible, which is palpably notorious over the whole world for infidelity and mistranslation—ay, on the vital points too, done, not by the ignorance of men unversed in the Greek language, but by men who deliberately sat down to pervert and vitiate its sacred and inviolable doctrines. The learned gentleman tells us he has read it over and over again in Greek.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I said, in Hebrew.

Mr. FRENCH.—What! the New Testament in Hebrew? [Laughter.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No! I said the Old in Hebrew? and the New Testament in Greek.

Mr. FRENCH.—Oh, very well; "the New Testament in Greek."

Now he must well know how frequently unfaithful it is. I have not time to go into many proofs; but there is one which I shall present to the notice of this assembly, to show you how infamously mistranslated it is. I call my friend's attention to 1 Cor. vii. 9: "But if they cannot contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn." Now, my friends, that is not the original. It is a falsehood imposed on you! It is not the sacred word of God. It is the impious word of interpolating man! The original is here: *εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεῖονται*, that is, "if they *do not* contain, let them marry." What could authorize men to sit down and put the words "if they cannot?" Had it been "if they cannot," the Greek would have been *οὐ δύναται*. Do not interpreters like these draw down upon themselves the imprecation denounced against those who add any thing to, or take anything from, that sacred book? But, my friends, there was good, solid reason at the

time for mistranslating. The reformers in this country, who had taken solemn vows to God that they would never marry, took this passage which is thus mistranslated, and pointed to it in palliation of their crime. Now, my friends, to show you how that would act on the Bible, "they cannot contain," I call your attention to the second chapter of the first Epistle of Peter, v. 11: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."

Again, listen to St. Paul: "For the grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, teaching us, that by denying ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." Titus ii. 11, 12.

If my time would permit it, I would notice innumerable other mistranslations of a still more flagrant and iniquitous cast; but I am diverted from the direct subject of remark, and I am sorry for it, by those observations upon Dupin which my learned antagonist has made. I told him that Dupin was a man who, so far from being authorized in our Church, had been fulminated against at the time he wrote that abominable history by the heads of the Church; and I doubt whether he was a Catholic at all. I will read to you a quotation on this subject from Chalmers's Dictionary.

You must remember that this is a Protestant writer. It gives the worst account of things; but, bad as it is, it will do for my purpose this evening.

"The first volume of his 'Bibliothèque,' (says Chalmers,) was printed at Paris, 1686, 8vo; and the others in succession, as far as five volumes, which contained an ac-

count of the first eight centuries. The freedom, however, which he had used in criticizing the style, character, and doctrines of some of the ecclesiastical writers, roused the prejudices of the celebrated Bossuet, who exhibited a complaint against Dupin to Harlay, Archbishop of Paris. The Archbishop, accordingly, in 1693, published a decree against the work, yet with more deliberation than might have been expected. His Grace first ordered the work to be read by four doctors of divinity of the faculty of Paris, who perused it separately, and then, combining their remarks, drew up a report which they presented to the Archbishop.

"Dupin was then summoned before the Archbishop and the Doctors, and after several meetings, gave in a paper in which he delivered his opinion on the objections made to his book in such a manner as to satisfy them that, however liberal his expressions, he was himself sound; but the work itself, they thought, nevertheless, must be condemned, 'as containing several propositions that are false, rash, scandalous, capable of offending pious ears, tending to weaken the arguments, which are brought from tradition to prove the authority of the canonical books of Holy Scripture, and of several other articles of faith; injurious to general councils, to the Apostolic See, and to the fathers of the church; erroneous, and leading to heresy.'"

Such, gentlemen, is the extract from Dupin; and such is the Catholic evidence brought forward by my reverend antagonist, namely, the evidence of a man convicted of *writing works leading to heresy, and "injurious to the holy Apostolic See."* Such, I say, is the evidence whereby he would give a concussion to those grand liturgies of the

church, which all learned Protestants, vying in zeal for them with all learned Catholics, cry out unanimously, *Illa manent immota locis, neque ab ordine cedunt*, that is, they are propped upon an immovable basis. Go, then, my reverend friend, I exclaim; and when you bring again Catholic witnesses against Catholic writings, see that they come not with the brand of heresy on their fronts.

But again, is it not unfair in the learned gentleman, who knew this, to come and bring Dupin against us? I shall merely quote one more extract, with reference to that celebrated passage: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Now the fact is, that this has been frequently urged by men who have not reflected deeply on the Bible. There is one way of reading the Testament which consists in merely *reading* the words, and another which is to dive profoundly into their meaning. In the first place, the learned gentleman knows, because I heard him at a lecture explain and acknowledge, that the word "woman" is not the same in signification in Greek as it is in English.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No!

Mr. FRENCH.—Well, at least it was Mr. Parkinson, on the learned gentleman's side. [Laughter.] Mr. P. admitted it. He had the candour to say, that in Greek it was a far softer appellation, and did not sound so harshly in the Greek as it does in English; but that it was a tender, and soft, and endearing appellation. I shall, however, translate it myself. I declare that it is susceptible of both translations. But this is certain [the learned gentleman here alludes to the marriage feast at Cana], there was a perfect intelligence and understanding between the Mother and the Son. The Virgin knew what was going on in the mind

of the Saviour; for, without one word from him, she orders the servants to get ready the vessels, and not a word intervened, significative of any such desire from the Saviour. And thus the first great miracle was wrought before his time for the working of miracles was come, to show the eminent dignity of the blessed woman, who was to be "blessed throughout all generations;" to show that, in the language of St. Irenæus, "she was to be recognised as our advocate without destroying the intercession of the great Mediator." But, my friends, were I to listen to the learned gentleman's flights of eloquence and rhetoric for whole days and years, he never would convince me, or any man who knows what the laws of reasoning are, that there is greater propriety in one sinful man demanding the prayers of another on earth, than of a man asking the prayers of a glorified spirit in heaven. For my friend knows that the Bible says saints are equal to the angels: they are made perfect—are equal to the angels. What part of the Bible can my friend bring forward to prove his position—that strange inconsistency, which he repeats over and over again in his didactic style—namely, that it is lawful to ask the prayers of a neighbour, but not to give you permission to pray to the blessed, who are before the throne of grace, and enjoying the rich beatitudes of heaven?—declaring that it is preposterous; that it is interfering with the one great Intercessor! Well, my answer to that is just as dogmatical and didactic as his own. I say that it does not interfere at all; that it is a custom that was established in the first ages of Christianity, and has been transmitted to me from the apostles; and I will cling to it to the very end of my life.

Now, gentlemen, I shall show you that this adoration or veneration of saints and angels, and holy things, is sanctioned in many of the passages of the New Testament. In the first place, I quote, "Exalt ye the Lord and worship at his footstool." Now, I have told you, that not without reason is it called the footstool of the Lord, for it was placed over the propitiatory ark, as if it were the seat of God, which was held by the hand of the cherubim, as we find in the beginning of the psalm. And here, by-the-bye, I will answer another passage brought against us with respect to images and statues, from which we are charged with idolatry by our malignant enemies. And I would here mention that the carvings of the cherubim were appointed by God himself. I quote from Psalm xxxii. 7. "We will go into his tabernacles, and we will worship at his footstool—*adorabimus scabellum pedum ejus.*" I contend that this is a gross mistranslation. It is "we will worship his footstool," and not "at his footstool." Now it is manifest from these places that some species of adoration is directed to be observed, from the words "to worship;" and lastly, that this worship is not of a civil institution, is fully evident from the words of David himself; "for it is holy," that is, "the footstool is holy." I said the adjective may be feminine or masculine. Again, I quote 1 Chron. chap. xxix. ver. 20: "And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God; and all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord and their king." There, you see, is the same word applied for the worshipping God and kings; which at once overturns my friend's whole argument as to its being unlawful

for us to venerate and worship the saints of God. Here we have the same word "worship" applied to God and to kings. Of course the same species of worship was not intended to be conveyed, but the same word is used, and that is enough to confound my friend for ever.

Mr. CUMMING here whispered to some persons next him, upon which Mr. FRENCH continued: Do you deny my position?

Rev. J. CUMMING (smiling or laughing).—Do you mean to make a distinction between the two?

Mr. FRENCH.—If you laugh at the argument, it is unseasonable for me to proceed till you get into a serious mood. I say that the word is used indiscriminately, and is either significant of worship due to God, or worship due to kings, and therefore to saints. But the worship of God is a prostration of all the powers of the soul in humble adoration: the prostration to saints is an inferior kind; it is a mere veneration of them, as being persons infinitely honoured and exalted by the Lord Jesus Christ. But the ark is not said to be worshipped on account of any civil honour or pre-eminence, but because it is sacred and holy, since it is the footstool of God. In the second place, in Scripture, wherever we find any one worshipped, the construction is uniformly made with *Lamed*, as in Genesis vii. 23: "And Abraham stood up and bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth." Now it says, "he *bowed* himself to the people of the land:" that is, he worshipped by prostration of body. There, you see, the word is again used. In Latin it will be *Adoravit Abraham populum terræ*—"Abraham adored or worshipped the people of the land." Thirdly, admitting it to signify temple, still the same thing

would be signified, for the Hebrew word is, "Bow yourselves down to that king, or worship the footstool"—*Incurtate vos ad illam rem*. The learned gentleman may pride himself on his knowledge of Hebrew, but I can tell him that Cardinal Bellarmine was equal to him or any man now living, in Hebrew; and these arguments are drawn from a fountain that will stand against any of the theologians of the present day. But all this is proved, most irrefragably, by adverting to other places in the Bible. I quote 1 Sam. vi. 19:—"And he smote the men of Bethshemeth, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord; even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men, and the people lamented because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter." You see that for only looking into the ark so many were killed; no wonder that he says they fell down before the ark, and paid it an inferior kind of worship and adoration. Again, 2 Sam. vi. 6:—"And when they came to Nachon's threshing-floor, Uzzia put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it, for the oxen shook it; and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzia, and God smote him there for his error; and there he died by the ark of God." Now, certainly it was not for merely shaking the ark of God that this vengeance was inflicted; for certainly no injury could be inflicted on its mighty inmate. Lastly, on account of the honour due to the ark, no one dared to enter into the holy of holies where it stood, excepting the high-priest once a year, as St. Paul tells us in the 9th of Hebrews. Again, it is proved by the worship exhibited to angels by pious and prudent men, in Gen. chap. xviii. (now I wish to call your attention to this chap. xviii. ver. 1.)

—“And the Lord appeared to him in the plains of Mamre, as he sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day; and he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo! three men stood by him; and when he saw them he ran to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground.” Now, that very word “bowed himself toward the ground,” is in other places translated “worship or adored.” “And he said, My Lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant. Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree. And I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts; after that ye shall pass on; for therefore are ye come to your servant; and they said, So do as thou hast said.” Now is it not evident that they were looked upon as angels, and not as the Lord God? *Is it not evident that in falling down to adore them he committed no act of idolatry?* Is it not most evident that, had it been an idolatrous act, the prophet would have branded it as such in the pages of the Bible to all posterity? Then, with regard to the circumstance of refreshments addressed to these angels, would it not have afforded scope to the ridicule or the wit of a Julian-the-Apostate, or any Deist in those days, quite as plausible as the wit indulged in by my reverend antagonist, in laughing at our tenets where they happen to differ from his own? So easy a thing is it to laugh at sacred things, but so difficult is it to confute the sound usages of antiquity transmitted from age to age down to the present time! Again, Gen. xix. 1: “And there came two angels to Sodom at even, and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom; and Lot seeing them, rose up to meet them, and he bowed

himself with his face towards the ground.” There is another prostration, which is the adoration for the worship of *Doulia*, and you see that it was paid to angels in Scripture. But I will prove that it went yet further, and that it was frequently paid to men: “And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant’s house, and tarry all night and wash your feet, and ye shall rise up early and go on your ways. And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night. And Abraham got up early in the morning to the place where he stood before the Lord; and he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace. And it came to pass when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt.” Then, chap. xx. ver. 17:—“Lo, Abraham prayed unto God, and God healed Abimelech, and his wife and maid-servants, and they bare children.” So that you see Abraham’s prayer was heard by God. Now, therefore, I ask, Upon what principle of philosophy, upon what principle of Christian philosophy, is it maintainable, that when a man is once in the regions of the blest he is no more to be heard? Again, I quote from Numb. xxii. 22: “And God’s anger was kindled before he went, and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him. Now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him; and the ass saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand; and the ass turned aside out of the way, and went into the field; and Balaam smote the ass, to turn him into the

way. But the angel of the Lord stood in the path of the vineyards, a wall being on this side and a wall on that. And when the ass saw the angel of the Lord she thrust herself into the wall, and crushed Balaam's foot against the wall; and he smote her again. And the angel of the Lord went further, and stood in a narrow place, where was no way to turn either to the right hand or to the left. And when the ass saw the angel of the Lord she fell down under Balaam; and Balaam's anger was kindled, and he smote the ass with a staff. And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said unto Balaam, What have I done unto thee, that thou hast smitten me these three times? And Balaam said unto the ass, Because thou hast mocked me: I would there were a sword in mine hand, for now would I kill thee. And the ass said unto Balaam, Am I not thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee? And he said, Nay. Then the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand: and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face. And the angel of the Lord said unto Balaam, Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold, I went out to withstand thee, because thy way is perverse before me. And the ass saw me and turned from me these three times; unless she had turned from me, surely now also I had slain thee, and saved her alive."

Such is the circumstance, well known in the Bible, of the ass speaking. Now I ask, gentlemen, If this book had not been handed down to you as inspired—having been kept and fostered in our libraries from age to age, and copied out carefully by our librarians—how

would you have known it to be inspired? Should I not hear my friend roaring out, "Can I believe in it?" No; and how is it he does believe at all, but by the testimony of the Catholic Church, that it is inspired? I believe every miracle recorded in the Bible from one end to the other; from the *alpha* to the *omega*, because it is corroborated by the ever-living, ever-preaching voice of the CATHOLIC CHURCH. There was no other in existence, from age to age, to testify what was the Bible and what was not. It was thus alone that we received Christianity. In the description I have read to you, Balaam most unquestionably did not worship before he recognised the angel. Again, chap. v. ver. 13, "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lift up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him with a sword drawn in his hand; and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, 'Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?' And he said, Nay, but as Captain of the Host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and saith unto him, What saith the Lord unto thy servant?" Now my friend maintained the other evening that this was "the Lord God, the Great Jehovah, the Captain of his own Host." "And the Captain of the Lord's Host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so." And why? Because it was the archangel Michael, just basking from the presence of the Almighty God in the midst of heaven, and the place whereon he stood bright with celestial radiance became that moment hallowed. If I were in the same manner to see the archangel Michael at this moment, I should fall prostrate without

committing an act of idolatry. "Here most indubitably," says Bellarmine, "we see the mediate honour which I am endeavouring to substantiate; for that Joshua did not imagine him whom he was worshipping to be God, is evident, since the angel had said that he was the minister of God. But the angel also exacted of him still greater honour, saying, 'Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy.' For that place was not holy except on account of the presence of the angel; for Joshua was not in a sacred place, but in the country fields of Jericho." And who was this Captain of the Lord's Host? Listen to Jude—"Yet Michael, the archangel, when, contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Our Church is inclined to imagine that it was Michael the archangel. Again (Rev. xii. 7), "And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels." Here again our Church contends that this captain was Michael the archangel. Yet one thing is certain: whether it was the archangel, or whether it was the Lord, Joshua took him for the angel, and prostrated himself in adoration before him in that species of adoration and worship which is due to angels. And it is not reprehended either by the angels or the prophet, and therefore all was right; and therefore the Catholic Church is right in the worship which she pays at the present day to saints. Again (1 Sam. xxviii. 14), "And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground and bowed himself." Now here is the adoration which was

paid to men. And mark here that the species of adoration which is paid to God goes under the same word as it does to men, but that it is a different species of worship.

So that when I hear my reverend antagonist inculcating upon you that we pay religious worship to Mary, I tell him boldly, that the salvation of his soul is at stake for such a daring assertion, unless he proves clearly that the Catholic pours forth that adoration which is due to God to the Virgin Mary. And I tell my rev. friend, with much shuddering awe, that that will be the grand sin he will have to answer for before the bar of divine justice—it will be the perpetual virulence with which he assails the Catholic, by stating over and over again that we give that worship to Mary which is to be given only to the great Lord of Heaven. I say it is the breath of slander, and he who "slandereth his neighbour" cannot enter the regions of eternal beatitude. He may wash it away by repentance,—and God grant that he may live long enough to do so, as well as to enter the portals of the Catholic Church! Again (1 Kings xviii. 7), "And as Obadiah was in the way, behold, Elijah met him; and he knew him and fell on his face and said, Art thou my Lord Elijah?" Obadiah here, a holy man, worships Elijah, prone on the earth. Now this cannot be a civil honour; for, as to human distinction of society, Obadiah was in a more elevated station than Elijah. Elijah was a private man; Obadiah was one of the princes of the people. He worships him, therefore, as a prophet, and as a man of God endowed with pre-eminent sanctity. Again, (2 Kings ii. 15,) "And when the sons of the prophets which were to view at Jericho saw him, they said, The spirit of Elijah doth rest on

Elisha. And they came to meet him, and they bowed themselves to the ground before him;" that is, they worshipped him. Again (Daniel ii. 46), "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him. The king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth, *it is*, that your God *is* a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldst reveal this secret." Here we see Nebuchadnezzar worships Daniel. Now who would either maintain or believe that one of the captives, such as was Daniel, would be worshipped by this mighty and powerful king by way of civil homage? He worshipped him, therefore, religiously, as a man full of God; nor did he worship him erroneously. Now as Daniel was, according—I think I may say—according to the admission of my reverend opponent [turning to Mr. Cumming]—

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I admit that he offered him *heathen* worship.

Mr. FRENCH.—Do you admit that Daniel was a man full of God? That is my point.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Yes.

Mr. FRENCH.—Well, then, I take the concession. He was a man full of God, and if so, Daniel was bound to protest against it; if it were improper or incorrect, he was bound to tell him, "No! you must not offer this worship to me, but to the living God." But all was correct according to the usages of the time. He worshipped him as a man full of God, nor did he worship him erroneously. Nor is there here any difficulty, my ingenious friend, ever on the watch to perplex and darken what is clear as noon-day—there is here, I say, no difficulty on the ground of that sacrifice which is

due to God alone, and which Daniel would have rejected. For the sacrifice peculiar to God is the immolation of animals, which is called in Hebrew *Zebha*.—*Immolans Diis eradicabitur præterquam Domino soli*. For there it is in Hebrew *Zebha*. But Nebuchadnezzar offered to Daniel, not *Zebha*, but *Minchah*, that is, "gifts and odours," each of which it was customary to offer as well to God as man. So says Cardinal Bellarmine, and I think he knew Hebrew as well as any man in the present age. We read in 1 Sam. x. 27, that some of the Israelites would not recognise Saul as king, nor send him presents; where the word for presents is *Minchah*. Again, St. Paul (Rom. ii. 10), "But glory and honour and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." Now we know that "glory and honour" are said to be due to God alone in Scripture, and yet we here find it, according to the apostle Paul, that "glory and honour" are due to "every man that worketh good;" and if a man is to have glory and honour on earth for working good, surely, when in heaven, his prayers may avail and revive him! And shall I be taught by a learned tutor of the nineteenth century, who contradicts the great lights of sound antiquity, that if the bones of a dead man could revive, the prayers of *living* saints in the realms of beatitude are of no validity whatever? What puerile and superficial reasoning is this!—unworthy a man endowed with sound faculties! I can only say, in termination of this discussion (of this subject at least), that I came prepared to answer the objections of my antagonist *seriatim*, in a calm, cool, and dispassionate manner; but I must say I have had my nerves considerably irritated by the

mode of argument which has been adopted. My learned friend has taunted me with several usages and peculiar notions, and the cruel practices of persons which were circumstantially incorrect, and which I regard with the utmost contempt. But his oriental epithets attributed to the Virgin meet with my concurrence; and I contend it is according to the usage of sound antiquity. Only I am offended at the circumstance of his attempting to draw ridicule on them; for, as I told you before, it is no article of my faith. I am not bound to say the Litany of Loretto. I may be a staunch member of our Church without ever saying one prayer to the Virgin, to angels or saints. All I would say is, that it is according to the practice of all sound antiquity, and an extremely salutary practice, to procure her mediation with her blessed Son Christ Jesus. That is all the doctrine; and it is unjust, therefore, to bring forward what one man and what another says. I am not acting contrary to the Church if I differ, as I do, from many of the explanations of Bellarmine on different subjects. I am not acting contrary to the Church if I differ with Delahogue on many points. —Again (2 Kings xiii. 21): “And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that behold they espied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and, when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet.” Here we have, gentlemen, the circumstance of the body’s touching the dead bones of Elisha, and of the man reviving; and why, let me ask the rev. gentleman, who laughs at relics, may not the bones of saints have the same efficacy at the present day? Gentlemen, when I take a retrospect of the whole

of my arguments on this question, I am satisfied with the arguments I have laid before you to prove that the doctrine is *apostolical*, and not a product of the “*dark ages*,” as my antagonist contends. I have heard nothing but wild declamation against these usages; nothing but expressions of horror at my preferring the testimony of Irenæus, given in the year of our Lord 177, to that of the Rev. Mr. Cumming, solemnly deposed against them in the year of our Lord 1839, accompanied with expressions of tender sympathy for the salvation of my soul. Let me and my fellow-Catholics, I say, save our souls for ourselves, according to the precepts of those holy men who evangelized this nation and all the nations of the world; who went about preaching and practising their doctrines and pure morality. Those men who handed down the Bible to us,—they ought to know something of the pure meaning of the Bible, feeding on it as they did from morning to night; they ought to know what interpretation to affix to it. And here, by-the-by, the way my learned friend adopts is not that which would persuade any of the Roman Catholics in this room to quit their Church and join the establishment of my learned friend. If my learned friend would condescend to give them solid proof *why* they should quit the Church of ages, he would be more likely to succeed—if he plausibly show cause *why* they should enter into the various dissenting tabernacles and conventicles of the day, where they are all fighting with one another and identifying themselves with that description of men in the Bible, where it is said, “And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians; and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every

one against his neighbour; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom." Such is precisely the state of all the Protestants in this kingdom—all sects of Protestantism fighting with one another. Where alone on earth is perfect unanimity to be found? It is to be found *alone*, if you will but exert the eyes of reason, in the bosom of the Catholic Church. Look at the same dogmas believed from age to age by all nations, speaking different languages—the Arminians, Cyrians, Copts, Eutychians, Nestorians, Greeks—all nations alike adoring their God in the one same sacred service, and all contributing to the accomplishment of that one great prophecy of Malachi—that sacrifices should continually be offered until the final consummation of time. All venerating and invoking saints and angels; all adhering to the doctrine of purgatory, which we are about to discuss, and which is the next subject for debate; all, in one word, having a rule of faith which, I shall easily prove to you, will put your tortuous and inconsistent rule to the blush, when we come to examine them together.

But, my friends, I shall call on my learned antagonist to the end of this discussion, and I *shall* never cease to remind him of it, in order that he may tell us satisfactorily how it is that all these tenets which we are engaged in defending are still adhered to by nations who separated from us in the fourth century. Can any learned Protestant divine, or any learned Protestant near my learned friend, whisper anything to his ear whereby he can extricate himself from this insuperable difficulty? What an extraordinary combination must that have been amongst those sects, who hate the Catholic Church with

as much reality as my friend abominates our tenets—what an extraordinary combination, I say, must that have been, in some dark age, when the Eutychians and Nestorians combined with the Church of Rome to impose upon the world the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints and Angels! Again, if you are to take the Bible as your rule of faith, it is your duty to see that you have the whole Bible, and not a mutilated Bible. But your Bible is most notoriously false in its integrity. It has rejected many of those books which have been received un murmuringly by the whole Catholic Church through twelve centuries. And by what right is it that you are robbed of these books? This is the way that I enter into argument, not by *ornithological* disquisitions as to the proper moulting season for the eagles, and the supreme efficacy of crying out *Abba*, Father! and several other rhetorical flourishes which have nothing to do with the subject. I argue, as I told you in the beginning, like a logician. It is this cloud-soaring propensity of my learned friend, when put in contrast with my sober march upon the terra-firma of rational argumentation, my Protestant brethren, that encourages me to hope most ardently that, at the termination of this dispute, many of you will come to be instructed at the feet of our reverend priests. There is the *genuine* priest in succession from the days of the apostles. The members of the Church of England say they received ordination from us at the time of the Reformation. We *deny* that we ever gave it them; we deny that they are priests, or have any apostolicity about them. Therefore, of course, since they boast of having been originally ordained by us, on the other hand, they acknow-

ledge the validity of our ordination; but, on the other hand, if I were a priest, as I told you before, and were to turn Protestant, I *could* mount the pulpit and preach their doctrines immediately; whilst, if the Archbishop of Canterbury or York were to turn Catholics tomorrow, we should tell them, "You are not ordained in our Church, which alone can prove its descent from the apostles." But so it is in this land; I might almost call it this land of infidelity. You are defrauded not only of the Bible, but there is no valid priesthood in the land, recognised by all sects, except the Roman Catholic; and to that priesthood I recommend my friend with as much earnest solicitude as he endeavours to wean Catholics from the rock of ages. To that priesthood I would advise my Protestant brethren to have recourse. There you will have a rule of faith expounded to you which will surpass every other in purity and in excellence; there you will float into a harbour of tranquillity, and find that calm and refreshing rest which a mutable doctrine to the soul of man can never possibly administer.

It is no later than a few years ago that you used to offer a prayer to St. Michael the Archangel. You have that prayer still in your own prayer-books—a fact which must condemn Protestants on the ground of mutability of doctrine. There has not been one shadow of mutability amongst us; but we see an eternal vacillation, a perpetual tendency to change, in yours. Take the Creed of St. Athanasius, in the Thirty-nine Articles, which creed declares that "out of the true Church no man can be saved," declaring that "*absque dubio in æternum peribit.*" If you believe that yours is the true Church, then you must believe that

every one out of that Church must be damned; and yet you rail against the Catholic because, immutable in his tenets, he sheds his tears and prayers for the dead, and offers up his orisons to the blessed.

Gentlemen, as I have but a few moments left, I am desirous of calling your attention to this passage from Isaiah xxxv. 8: "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those, the way-faring men, though fools shall not err therein." This "way" has been opened to you clearly and directly during the course of my discussion. It is this "way" into which I pray you may all enter. The Church has been visible from age to age; the rock of ages stands where it did in the days of Irenæus, who tells us that, "on account of its superior headship in cases of difficulty, all other churches must have resort." "*Ad hanc ecclesiam propter potio-rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.*"—*Irenæ. Advers. Hæres. lib. iii. cap. iii. 175.*—[Here the learned gentleman was obliged to close abruptly, the usual hour having expired.]

JOHN KENDAL, Esq., the Chairman on behalf of the Catholics, then rose and announced a fresh subject for discussion on the Tuesday following, viz.—PURGATORY; upon which subject Mr. French would deliver the leading address. The assembly, which was much crowded, then separated in its usually characteristic orderly manner, at about half-past ten o'clock.

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

SEVENTH EVENING, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1839.

SUBJECT :

PURGATORY.

MR. FRENCH.—If ever there was an occasion when I rose to address this assembly, and felt myself little inclined to be lavish of words, or to indulge myself in any preliminary remarks, it is the present. And the reason of it is, gentlemen, because I wish to embody, in my part of the disputation, such a mass of evidence, as will be totally incompatible with anything like an indulgence in metaphorical flourish and display, and all the fine gauderies of rhetoric. I wish, gentlemen, to adhere solely and exclusively to argument, and not to put it in the power of my antagonist to reproach me with anything like a deviation from it. In arguing upon this great subject (on which we may be erroneous in our view, and on which, if we be so, I agree with my learned friend that we are so most fatally; and if he, on the other hand—if the doctrines of his Church be founded on error, on this subject, as well as on others which we have discussed, he will certainly be proved to have wandered egregiously from the line of apostolical tradition) I shall endeavour to pay my usual reverence to the laws of reasoning. Before, however, I enter upon the argument, I would wish to read you what is the plain exposition of our doctrine upon Purgatory. I wish to call your particular attention to the exposition of the doctrine of Purgatory, as it has been laid down from age to age in the Catholic Church, ever since the times of the apostles. “Catholics hold that there is a Purgatory, that is to say, a place or state,

where souls departing this life, with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment, still remaining due; or, not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects which we call venial sins, are purged before their admittance into heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter.”

“We also believe, that such souls so detained in Purgatory, being the living members of Christ Jesus, are relieved by the prayers and suffrages of their fellow-members here on earth. But where this place may be—of what nature or quality the pains may be—how long souls may be there detained—in what manner the suffrages made on their behalf may be applied—whether by way of satisfaction or intercession, &c., are questions superfluous and impertinent as to faith.”

Now, my friends, my learned antagonist comes to fight his battles this day against the Catholic Church, just as he came upon the last occasion, when the discussion was the Invocation of Saints and Angels—that is, under the protective shield of a man who in former times was denounced as a heretic by the Church. I allude to Ærius, in the fourth century. He was the first person, as our ecclesiastical historians record it, who raised his voice against the apostolic doctrine of praying for the dead. If you would condescend, my friends, to turn over the leaves of ecclesiastical history, you would find that from the days of the apostles, from the

very dawn of Christianity, every age has been signalized by the springing up of some heresy in the Church of God; and it has generally happened that when heretics have raised their voice against the Church of God, they have been most virulent in calumniating and defaming it. Thus it was with Vigilantius, who rose in the fourth century against the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints and Angels. Thus it was in the very days of the Apostles and Evangelists, that a sect arose denying the divinity of Christ, which called forth the production of that splendid Gospel which we now enjoy, called the Gospel of St. John, to confute the monstrous errors of Cerinthus. Then there came a host of divers heresies in succession, all marked down by the Catholic Church—for they ever had their writers with pens in their hands to note down the springing up of heresies. Then there arose a sect who denied that Christ, when on earth, had a real body; maintaining that he was merely an aerial substance, immaterial and unencumbered with flesh; called the Gnostics or Doceti. Then there was another sect, who paid divine adoration to angels—not Catholics, good and virtuous, but wicked men, brought up, indeed, originally in the true Church; and who began to offer sacrifices unto angels, which is alluded to so forcibly in the Epistle of Paul concerning the worship of angels. These men were anathematized by the Church, and they formed a distinct body and heretical communion. After this, in the fourth century, sprang up the Ærians. Now, it is under the auspices of their champion Ærius, that my learned antagonist intends to establish his position this day. I come as usual, my friends, under the auspices of the firm, indissoluble, infrangible phalanx and

protection of the FATHERS of the Church, and I envy not my friend the *heretical banners* under which he has come to fight this day. Yes, my friends, I shall prove to you, as I have done from the beginning in all my positions, that the fathers of the Church are ever on our side. Those columns of orthodoxy, those models of true sanctity and apostolicity, were looked upon as such by all Protestants and all Catholic authors until the dismal, gloomy century in which we are now living, where men are perpetually endeavouring to impugn their sanctity and their orthodoxy. My learned friend has frequently, throughout his arguments, and in the course which he has adopted, endeavoured to weaken the authority of the fathers of the Church, by stating that they are “perpetually knocking their heads against one another;” in answer to which statement I shall reply this day by showing you its utter groundlessness. There are particular passages in Scripture which they certainly interpret diversely; but, as I told him before, and I must repeat it again and again constantly throughout the course of this discussion, begging you to bear it in mind, in order that you may know at the end of it whether he or I adhere to truth strictly—I, in saying that the fathers of the Church are all unanimous on the grand, vital, fundamental articles of our faith; or he, in declaring most positively and most dogmatically that they are all at war with one another. This, gentlemen, is the grand point for me to impose upon your memories this day; for if I be borne out in the assertion, that in all the articles of our faith, they are ever combatting for us (as I said before) in one indissoluble and infrangible phalanx, then the assertion of my friend completely falls to the ground, that they

are always knocking their heads against one another.

The first father of the Church that I shall quote is one whose word is only to be taken on points wherein he agrees with all the other fathers of the Church; for it is well known that Tertullian, who was born 150 years after Christ—it is well known that he fell into a heresy, but at the same time Protestants and Catholics both quote him on certain fundamental points. These are the words of Tertullian:

TERTULLIAN, L. C.—Among the apostolical traditions, received from their fathers, and not enforced by the positive words of Scripture, he reckons “oblations for the dead on the anniversary day.” *De Cor. Milit.* p. 289.—In his treatise on single marriages, he advises the widow “to pray for the soul of her departed husband, entreating repose to him, and participation in the first resurrection, and making oblation for him on the anniversary days of his death; which if she neglect, it may truly be said of her, that, as far as in her lies, she has repudiated her husband.” *De Monogamia*, c. x. p. 955.—“Reflect,” he says to widowers, “for whose soul you pray, for whom you make annual oblations.”—*Exhort. ad Castit.* c. xi. p. 942.

I need not call your attention to the fact which stares you so palpably in the face, my Protestant brethren, that, if ours be a superstitious and an erroneous doctrine, it is at least extremely old. Cyprian, who flourished 250 years after Christ, says:—

ST. CYPRIAN, L. C.—“Our predecessors prudently advised, that no brother, departing this life, should nominate any churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose; of

which we have had a late example, when no oblation was made, nor prayer, in his name, offered in the Church.” *Ep.* lxvi. p. 114.—*In other letters he speaks of the same offerings.* *Ep.* xxviii. p. 32, and *Ep.* xxxvii. p. 50.—“It is one thing to be a petitioner for pardon, and another to arrive at glory; one to be cast into prison and not go out from thence till the last farthing be paid, and another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one, in punishment of sin, to be purified by long suffering and purged by long fire, and another to have expiated all sins by (*previous*) suffering; one, in fine, at the day of judgment to wait the sentence of the Lord, another to receive an immediate crown from him.”—*Ep.* lii. p. 72.

I shall then go to Eusebius of Cæsarea, the ecclesiastical historian. Describing the funeral of the Emperor Constantine, he thus writes:

“In this manner did Constantius perform the last duties in honour of his father. But when he had departed with his guards, the ministers of God, surrounded by the multitude of the faithful, advanced into the middle space, and with prayers performed the ceremonies of divine worship. The blessed prince, reposing in his coffin, was extolled with many praises: when the people, in concert with the priests, not without sighs and tears, offered prayers to heaven for his soul; in this manifesting the most acceptable service to a religious prince. God, besides, thus continued to show his kindness to his servant. He had bestowed the succession of the empire on his sons; and now, in compliance with his ardent wishes, he gives him a place near the bodies of the holy apostles, in order that he may enjoy their blessed fellowship, and in their temple be associated

with the people of God. He would thus also be admitted to a participation in the religious rites, the mystic sacrifice, and holy suffrages of the faithful."—*De Vita Constant.* l. iv. c. lxx., lxxi., p. 667.

Again, I quote from Arnobius, who flourished some time after:—

ARNOBIUS, L. C. — "Why were the oratories (of the Christians) destined to savage destruction, wherein prayers are offered up to the sovereign God; peace and pardon are implored for all men, magistrates, soldiers, kings, friends, and enemies, for those who are alive, and for those who have quitted their bodies."—L. iv. *adv. Gentes*, p. 152. Edit. Lugduni Batavorum, 1651.

I cannot but call your attention here, my friends, for a single moment, *en passant*, to the circumstances of funeral pomp which attended the burial of the late George the Fourth. At his grave, my friends, you have the most incontestable evidence of prayers being offered up for the repose of his soul. But to return: St. Ephrem of Edessa, a pious and learned deacon, thus speaks:—

ST. EPHREM OF EDESSA, G. C.—In a work entitled his *Testament*, this pious and learned deacon thus speaks:—"My brethren, come to me, and prepare me for my departure, for my strength is wholly gone. Go along with me in psalms and in your prayers; and please constantly to make oblations for me. When the thirtieth day shall be completed, then remember me: for the dead are helped by the offerings of the living—*εὐεργετοῦνται οἱ θνήτοι ἐν προσφοραῖς ἀνομνησέως περὶ τῶν ζώντων ἁγίων*. Now listen with patience to what I shall mention from the Scriptures. Moses bestowed blessings on Reuben after the third generation. (Deut. xxxiii. 6.) But if the dead are not aided,

why was he blessed? Again, if they be insensible, hear what the apostle says: '*If the dead rise not again at all, why are they then baptized for them?*' (1 Cor. xv. 29.) If also the sons of Mathathias (2 Maccab. xii.) who celebrated their feasts in figure only, could cleanse those from guilt by their offerings who fell in battle, how much more shall the priests of Christ aid the dead by their oblations and prayers!"—*In Testament.* t. ii. p. 234, p. 271. Edit. Oxon.

And remember, my friends, I wish to impress on you—for I may be probably taunted by my antagonist that I am always at these fathers (for I have not the spiritual disease called *Patrophobia*, which I attributed to my friend), still I wish to impress on you and on him, that the fathers always come with the Bible in their hands, and therefore, my friend can have no objection to them. Here St. Ephrem alludes to the two books of the Maccabees, which books, of course, will be as usual most daringly assailed by my bright luminary of the nineteenth century.

Again, I quote St. Cyril of Jerusalem. He says, that in the liturgies of the church—alluding to these liturgies which I shall be obliged to cite to you to-night, however reluctant my friend may be to listen to them, especially as he has not brought one tittle of evidence to shake their authenticity; (and for that purpose he went to Dupin, who is one of those dead weeds which I throw over into his garden very completely;) St. Cyril says:—

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, G. C.—"Then (in the liturgy of the Church) we pray for the holy fathers and the bishops that are dead; and, in short, for all those who are departed this life in our communion; believing that the souls of those for

whom the prayers are offered received very great relief, while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar. This we will show you by an example: for I know there are many who say—What good can it do to a soul which is departed out of this life, whether with sins or without them, to be remembered in this sacrifice? But tell me, I pray you, if a king had sent into banishment some persons that had offended him, and their friends should present him with a crown of great price to appease his anger, might not the king, on that account, show some favour to the guilty persons? So do we address our prayers to God for those that are dead, though they were sinners; not by presenting to him a crown, but by offering up to him Christ, who was sacrificed for our sins, propitiating him, who is so merciful, for them and for us.”—*Catech. Mystag.* v. n. ix. x. p. 328.

The fourth Council of Carthage, in the year 398, says:—

FOURTH COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE, L. C. (A.D. 398).—“Penitents, who have carefully submitted to the laws of the Church, should they accidentally die on the road, or by sea, where no assistance could be given, shall be remembered in the prayers and offerings of the faithful.”—*Can. lxxix. Conc. Gen.* t. ii. p. 1206. See also the twenty-ninth Canon of the preceding Council of Carthage.—*Ibid.* p. 1171.

Again, I quote Gregory of Nyssa:

ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, G. C.—“In order that to man might be left the dignity of free-will, and evil, at the same time, might be taken from him, Divine Wisdom thus devised. He allows him to remain subject to what himself has chosen; that, having tasted of the evil which he desired, and learned by experience how bad an exchange has

been made, he might again feel an ardent wish to lay down the load of those vices and inclinations which are contrary to reason; and thus, in this life, being renovated by prayers and the pursuit of wisdom, or, in the next, being expiated by the purging fire, *δια του καθαρσιου πυρος*, he might recover the state of happiness which he had lost. Man otherwise must incline to that side to which his passions tend. But when he has quitted his body, and the difference between virtue and vice is known, he cannot be admitted to approach the Divinity till the purging fire shall have expiated the stains with which his soul was infected:—*τον καθαρσιου πυρος τον εμμιχθεντα τη ψυχη ρυτον αποκαθηραντος*. That same fire, in others, will cancel the corruption of matter and the propensity to evil.”—*εν τω καθαρσιω πυρι. Orat. de Defunctis*, t. ii. p. 1066, 1067, 1068.

And now, my friends, you will have a very different interpretation of “the hay and stubble” from my reverend antagonist, to what St. Augustine and St. Ambrose and all the fathers give.

ST. AMBROSE, L. C.—Having, in a preceding part of the chapter, spoken of the effect of penal fire on what the apostle calls silver and gold, and hay and stubble, in our actions, he concludes: ‘*We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil.*’ (2 Cor. v. 10.) Take care, that you carry not with you to the judgment of God wood nor stubble, which the fire may consume. Take care, lest, having one or two things that may be approved, you, at the same time, have much that may give offence. ‘*If any man’s works burn, he shall suffer*

loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' (1 Cor. iii. 15.)

Whence it may be collected, that the same man is saved in part, and is condemned in part:—*Salvatur ex parte, et condemnatur ex parte.*

"Conscious, therefore, that there are many judgments, let us examine all our actions. In a man that is just, loss is suffered; grievous is the burning of some work; in the wicked man wretched is the punishment."—*Serm. xx. in Psalm cxviii. t. i. p. 1238.*—"If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss.' False doctrine, which shall perish, is the work that is said to burn; for all bad things must perish. To suffer loss, is to suffer pain. And who, that is in pain, does not suffer loss?

'But he shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' He will be saved, the apostle said, because his substance shall remain, while his bad doctrine shall perish. Therefore he said, 'yet so as by fire;' in order that his salvation be not understood to be without pain. He shows, that he shall be saved indeed, but that he shall undergo the pain of fire, and be thus purified; not like the unbelieving and wicked man, who shall be punished in everlasting fire."—

Comment. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. t. ii. in App. p. 122. See Note, p. 44.—In his funeral oration on the two emperors, Valentinians, he says: "Blessed shall you both be, if my prayers can avail any thing. No day shall pass, in which I will not make honourable mention of you; no night, in which you shall not partake of my prayers. In all my oblations I will remember you."—*In Obitu Valent. t. xi. p. 1194.*—Of the Emperor Theodosius he likewise says:—"Lately we deplored together his death, and now, while Prince Honorius is present before our altars, we celebrate the fortieth day.—Some observe the third and

the thirtieth, others the seventh and the fortieth.—Give, O Lord, rest to thy servant Theodosius, that rest which thou hast prepared for thy saints. May his soul thither tend, whence it came, where it cannot feel the sting of death, where it will learn, that death is the termination, not of nature, but of sin.—I loved him, therefore will I follow him to the land of the living; I will not leave him, till, by my prayers and lamentation, he shall be admitted to the holy mount of the Lord, to which his deserts call him."—*De Obitu Theodosii. Ibid. p. 1197-8, 1207-8.*—On the death of his brother Satyrus, he expresses the like sentiments, and utters the like prayers: he also mentions, that to the celebration of the birth-day succeeded the annual celebration of the day of the death.—*De Obitu Satyri fratris sui, t. xi. p. 1135-6.*—"Wherefore I am of opinion, that she (the sister of Faustinus) ought not so much to be a subject of our grief, as of our prayers. I think that her soul should not be lamented by your tears, but rather recommended by oblations to the Lord."—*Ep. xxxix. ad Faustinum, t. xi. p. 944.*

Some that be saved, yet so as by fire. And so say I, and so says everybody who has been catechized in the Catholic Church, that has been catechized by the apostles down to the present day; in every Church throughout the length and breadth of Europe; in all those who separated from us, and to whom I have so frequently called the attention of my friend, but to which he so uniformly turns a deaf ear.

I hope, by-the-bye, my friend will have the goodness to explain to you what it is St. Ambrose means by these oblations; a word which must necessarily be distasteful to the

modernized car of my reverend antagonist.

Again, St. Epiphanius, who has written a history of all the heresies that have arisen, in which he mentions the famous heretic Ærius, *under whose standard my friend is about to display his talents this day*, without, of course, being tainted himself with his infectious principles,—St. Epiphanius, I say, who has likewise given an account of the practices and usages of the Catholic Church in a very elaborate manner, wrote thus:—

ST. EPIPHANIUS, G. C.—“There is nothing more opportune, nothing more to be admired, than the rite which directs the names of the dead to be mentioned.—They are aided by the prayer that is offered for them; though it may not cancel all their faults.—We mention both the just and sinners, in order that for the latter we may obtain mercy.”—*Hær. lv. sive lxxv. t. i. p. 911.*

Again, St. Chrysostom, whose works are the delight of every person well versed in the Greek language, wrote thus:—

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, G. C.—“It is not in vain that oblations and prayers are offered, and alms given, for the dead. So has the Divine Spirit ordained things, that we might mutually assist one another.—The deacon (in the Greek liturgy) proclaims:—*For them who are dead in Christ, and for them who make a memorial of them.*—The victim is in the hands (of the minister); all things are ready; the angels and the archangels assist; the Son of God is present; a holy horror seizes the minds of the people, while the sacred rite is celebrated. And do you think that this is done without effect?—Consider well: the awful mystery is then announced, that God gave himself a sacrifice for the world: and then it is that he re-

members those who have sinned. For as when the trophies of war are exhibited, not they only who aided the victory partake of the triumph, but also, on the occasion, prisoners are released from their bonds; so is it here. It is the moment of victory and trophies: ‘*As often as you shall eat this bread, ye show forth the death of the Lord.*’ (1 Cor. xi. 26.)” *Homil. xxi. in Acta Apost. t. ix. p. 175-6.*—“Is the sinner dead? It is proper to rejoice that an end is put to his sins, that they can no longer be accumulated. And now it becomes a duty, as far as we may be able, to aid him, not by tears, but by prayer, and supplication, and alms, and offerings. Nor were these means lightly devised; nor is it in vain that, in the sacred mysteries, we mention the dead, imploring, for them, the Lamb that there lieth and *that taketh away the sins of the world*, begging that he will impart some consolation to them. Let us then aid these our brethren. For if the offering of Job could benefit his sons, why should you not believe, if you make offerings for the dead, that they may receive some consolation from them? God grants favours to the prayers of others, as St. Paul teaches: ‘*You helping withal in prayer for us; that for this gift obtained for us, by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many in our behalf.*’ (2 Cor. i. 11.) Let us not grow weary in affording aid to the dead, in offering prayers for them: prayer is the common victim of the world.”—*Homil. xli. in Ep. 1 ad Cor. t. x. p. 392-3.*—“Let us pity them; let us aid them as we may be able; let us obtain some comfort for them; small indeed, yet still some comfort. But how? by what means? Ourselves praying, and entreating others to do the same, and for them unceasingly

giving alms to the poor. Hence, comfort will be derived. God has said: '*I will defend this city to save it for my own sake, and for my servant David's sake.*' (2 Kings xix. 34.) If the remembrance alone of a just man was so prevalent, what may not works effect? Not without reason was it ordained by the apostles, that, in celebrating the sacred mysteries, the dead would be remembered; for they well know what advantage would thence be derived to them. Will not God be propitious when he looks down on the whole assembly of the people, raising their hands up to him; when he beholds the venerable choir of the priests, and the sacred victim lying on the altar?"—*Homil. iii. in Ep. ad Philip. t. xi. p. 217.*

I wonder what sacred rite that is, by-the-by, where he describes *the sacred victim lying on the altar?*

Again, St. Jerome.

ST. JEROME, L.C.—"If he, whose work has burned and suffered loss, (as the apostle says) shall lose the reward of his labour, yet shall he be saved by the trial of fire; so he *whose work shall abide which he built upon* shall be saved without fire. Thus there will be some difference in the degrees of salvation." *Adv. Jovinian. l. ii. t. iv. Pars xi., p. 215.*—"As we believe the torments of the devil and of those wicked men, who said in their hearts *There is no God*, to be eternal; so, in regard to those sinners who have not denied their faith, and whose works will be proved and purged by fire, we conclude that the sentence of the Judge will be tempered by mercy." *Comment. in c. lxx. Isai. t. ii. p. 492.*—He establishes the same doctrine against the Pelagians, *l. i. t. iv. Pars xi., p. 501, &c.*—In a letter of consolation to Pammachius on the death of his wife Paulina, he says: 'Other husbands strew

various flowers on the graves of their departed wives; but you bedew the venerable remains of Paulina with the sweet essences of charity; knowing, that *as water quenches fire, so do alms extinguish sin.*'—(*Eccles. iii. 33.*) *Ep. liv. ad Pammach. t. iv. p. 584.*

He establishes the same doctrine against the Pelagians.

Again, the great St. Austin, who lived in the same century:

ST. AUGUSTIN, L.C.—"Before the most severe and last judgment some undergo temporal punishments in this life; some after death, and others both now and then. But not all that suffer after death, are condemned to eternal flames. What is not expiated in this life to some is remitted in the life to come, so that they may escape eternal punishment."—*De Civit. Dei, l. xxi. c. xiii. t. vii. p. 634.*—"The prayers of the Church and of some good persons are heard in favour of those Christians who departed this life, not so bad as to be deemed unworthy of mercy, nor so good as to be entitled to immediate happiness. So also, at the resurrection of the dead, there will some be found, to whom mercy will be imparted, having gone through those pains to which the spirits of the dead are liable. Otherwise it would not have been said of some with truth, that their sin '*shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come,*' (Matt. xii. 32,) unless some sins were remitted in the next world."—*Ibid. c. xxiv. p. 642.*—"It cannot be denied, that the souls of the dead are relieved by the piety of the living, when the sacrifice of our Mediator is offered for them, or alms are distributed in the Church. They are benefited, who so lived as to have deserved such favours. For there is a mode of life, not so perfect as not to

require this assistance, nor so bad as to be incapable of receiving aid. The practice of the Church in recommending the souls of the departed is not contrary to the declaration of the Apostle, which says: '*We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil.*' (2 Cor. v. 10.) For this merit each one, in his life, has acquired, to be aided by the good works of the living. But all are not aided: and why so? Because all have not lived alike. When therefore the sacrifice of the altar, or alms, are offered for the dead; in regard to those whose lives were very good, such offices may be deemed acts of thanksgiving; acts of propitiation for the imperfect; and though to the wicked they bring no aid, they may give some comfort to the living." — *Enchirid.* c. ex. t. vi. p. 238.—“*Lord, chastise me not in thy anger.*” May I not be numbered with those, to whom thou wilt say: ‘*Go into eternal fire, which hath been prepared for the devil and his angels.*’ Cleanse me so in this life, make me such that I may not stand in need of that purifying fire, designed for those who shall ‘*be saved, yet so as by fire.*’ And why, but because (as the apostle says) they have built ‘*upon the foundation wood, hay, and stubble?*’ If they had built ‘*gold, and silver, and precious stones,*’ they would be secured from both fires; not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished for ever; but likewise from that fire which will purify those who shall be saved by fire. But because it is said, ‘*he shall be saved,*’ that fire is thought lightly of; though the suffering will be more grievous than anything man can undergo in this life.” — *Enarrat. in*

Ps. xxxvii. t. iv. p. 295.—“It cannot be doubted,” &c. See the passage, p. 284.—“We read in the Second Book of Maccabees, (xii. 43,) that sacrifice was offered for the dead; but though in the Old Testament no such words had been found, the authority of the universal Church must suffice, whose practice is incontrovertible. When the priest at the altar offers up prayers to God, he recommends in them the souls of the departed. When the mind sometimes recollects that the body of his friend has been deposited near the tomb of some martyr, he fails not, in prayer, to recommend the soul to that blessed saint; not doubting that succour may thence be derived. Such suffrages must not be neglected, which the Church performs in general words that they may be benefited, who have no parents, nor children, nor relations, nor friends.” — *De Cura pro Mortuis*, c. i. iv. t. vi. p. 516, 519.—The same sentiment is repeated through the whole treatise.

Gentlemen, when I read the New Testament, I read it by myself, without imagining at the moment that I am a Catholic, or thinking whether I am a Catholic or a Protestant, but applying my intellectual faculties to it; and I never come to that passage without deducing from it, according to the laws of sound reasoning, that there are some sins forgiven in the world to come. So says he, and so say I.

St. Jerome, therefore, notwithstanding the notes which my friend is about to take, alludes to fire in the other world. St. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, and contemporary with St. Jerome, and correspondent of St. Augustine, establishes the same doctrine in various passages of his writings.—See *Bibl. PP.* t. vi. p. 163, &c.

St. Nilus likewise :—

ST. NILUS, G.C.—“To be grieved, to weep, and fast immoderately, for the death of a relation, indicates unbelief and the want of hope. He who believes that he will rise again from the grave, will feel comfort ; will return thanks to God ; will change his tears into joy ; will pray that he may obtain eternal mercy, and will himself turn to the correction of his own failings.”—L. i. *Ep. ccxi. t. xi. p. 115.*

Arnobius the Younger :—

ARNOBIUS THE YOUNGER, L. C.—“They who offer money or gifts to the churches, and die in their sins, do it in order that they may be raised to eternal life by our prayers.”—*Bibl. PP. Mar. t. viii. p. 298.*

Now, gentlemen, you see the wonderful concurrence of the fathers upon fundamental points—no frail bond of endearment, by-the-bye, to induce the Catholic to cherish them in flat contradiction to what my learned friend asserted, that they are always at variance one with another. The battle, therefore, is mine, he must concede, or he must show where the discrepancy exists between them. I come now to those great liturgies, which, next to the Bible, ought to be most venerated by every Christian, unless my friend can this evening do what he struggled to do on a former occasion; that is, to shake their foundation. But—no; all the learned Protestant bishops—Cave, Bishop Bull, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and all the learned in that profession, confirm these as to substance.

But my friend will say, when he hears the long string of names which I quote against him, “These are weeds I throw over into your garden.” I shall willingly receive them if he thus treats Bishops Bull, and Cave, and Jeremy Taylor,

as he did Thorndyke and the others. And, by-the-bye, some Protestant gentlemen expressed some little indignation at his calling them “weeds.” They declare that Thorndyke, and others he mentioned, were an honour to the Protestant religion, and they could only account for it on the ground, that my learned friend having been bred up in Scotland, scarcely knows the difference of a weed from a flower. [Loud laughter.] Now, therefore, gentlemen, I go to the liturgies—the liturgy of Jerusalem. This is the great liturgy of James the Apostle, and I beg you to pay particular attention to its meaning. This is what I contend is called Mass, because *λειτουργία* is the Greek for mass, or sacrifice, as Hesekius explains it. Did you—[to the Rev. J. Cumming, who was at the moment talking]—say it was not :

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No; I did not.

Mr. FRENCH.—I quote from Hesekius.

All the Greeks who celebrate mass to this day always call Liturgia the sacrifice of the mass.

Now listen to the first.

This was poured forth from the lips of St. James the Apostle:

LITURGY OF JERUSALEM, G.C.—

“Again and again, we commemorate all the faithful departed, those who are departed in the true faith, from this holy altar, and from this town, and from every country; those who in the true faith have slept and are come to thee, the God and Lord of Spirits, and of all flesh.—Be mindful also, O Lord, of the orthodox priests, already departed, of the deacons, and secular persons, &c. who are departed in the true faith, and of those whom each one specifies in his mind. O Lord, God of Spirits and of all flesh, be mindful of all whom we commemo-

rate, who are gone out of this life in the orthodox faith; grant rest to their souls, bodies and spirits; deliver them from the infinite damnation to come, and make them worthy of that joy which is found in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Impute not to them their sins. Enter not into judgment with thy servants. Grant them rest, and be propitious, and forgive, O God, the follies and defects of us all, whether done knowingly or through ignorance," &c.—*Renaud.* t. xi. p. 38.

LITURGY OF ALEXANDRIA, G. C.—“Be mindful, O Lord, of our forefathers from the beginning; of every spirit of those who have departed in the faith of Christ, whom we commemorate this day. To the souls of all these, O Sovereign Lord our God, grant repose in thy holy tabernacles. Give rest to their souls, and render them worthy of the kingdom of heaven.”—*Ibid.* p. 150.

LITURGY OF CONSTANTINOPLE, G. C.—“Be mindful of all, O God, who have slept before us, in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life. We pray for the repose and the remission of the soul of thy servant N., in a place of rest, from which grief and lamentation are far removed; and make him to rest where he may see around him the light of thy countenance,” &c.—*Goar.* p. 78.

LITURGY OF ROME, L. C.—“Be mindful, also, O Lord, of thy servants N. and N. who are gone before us, with the sign of faith, and rest in the sleep of peace. To whom, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, grant, we beseech thee, a place of refreshment, of light, and of peace.”

LITURGY OF THE NESTORIANS, (who departed from us 1,400 years since) G. C.—“O Lord, powerful

God, receive this oblation, for all the departed, who being separated from us, have quitted this world.”—*Renaudot.* t. ii. p. 590.

LITURGY OF THEODORUS, G. C.—“O Lord our God, graciously receive from us this sacrifice of thanksgiving—that it may be in thy sight a good memorial of all the children of the Holy Catholic Church, of those who have passed out of this world in the true faith: that thou mayest, O God, graciously grant them pardon of all the sins and offences, by which, in this world, in a mortal body, and in a soul subject to inconstancy, they have sinned or offended before thee, because there is no one who does not sin.”—*Ibid.* p. 620.

LITURGY OF NESTORIUS, G. C.—“We pray and entreat thee, O Lord, be mindful of all our brethren in Christ, who are departed out of this life in the true faith, whose names are known to thee; loosing and remitting to them the sins and offences which, as men liable to error and passions, they have committed before thee, through the prayer and intercession of those who have been pleasing in thy sight.”—*Ibid.* p. 633.

COPTIC LITURGY OF ST. BASIL, G. C.—“Be mindful, also, O Lord, of all who have slept and reposed in the priesthood, and in every rank of the secular state. Vouchsafe, O Lord, to grant rest to the souls of them all in the bosom of the saints, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Command those, O Lord, whose souls thou hast received, to repose in this place, and preserve us,” &c.—*Renaudot.* t. i. p. 19.

ALEXANDRIAN LITURGY OF ST. BASIL, G. C.—“Be mindful, also, O Lord, of all the sacerdotal order who are now departed, and of those who were in a secular state. Grant that the souls of them all may rest

in the bosoms of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. — To those, O Lord, whose souls thou hast received, grant repose in that place, and vouchsafe to transfer them to the kingdom of heaven.”—*Ibid.* p. 73.

COPTIC LITURGY OF ST. GREGORY, G. C.—“Be mindful, O Lord, of our fathers and brethren, who have already slept in the orthodox faith; grant rest to them all with thy saints, and with those whose names have been commemorated.”—*Ibid.* p. 34.

ALEXANDRIAN LITURGY OF ST. GREGORY, G. C.—“Be mindful, O Lord, of our holy fathers, who are gone before us—and of every just spirit, consummated in the faith of Christ—also of those, who are commemorated this day, and of all the choirs of saints, by whose prayers and intercessions, have mercy on us.”—*Ibid.* p. 112.

COPTIC LITURGY OF ST. CYRIL, G. C.—“Have mercy, O Lord. To our fathers and brethren, who have slept, and whose souls thou hast received, give rest.”—*Ibid.* p. 41.

Now, gentlemen, I shall read to you what the Council of Trent says upon this article:

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

“As the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, has taught in her councils, from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the fathers, and this synod has now recently declared, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar—therefore this holy synod gives her commands to the bishops, to be particularly careful, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, which has been delivered by the holy fathers and sacred councils, be taught, and held,

and believed, and be every where preached: that all abstruse and subtle questions, which tend not to edification, and from which piety seldom draws any advantage, be avoided in public discourses before the people: that uncertain things, and such as have the appearance of falsehood, be not allowed to be made public, nor be discussed: and that whatever may tend to encourage idle curiosity and superstition; or may savour of filthy lucre, be prohibited as scandalous impediments to virtue.”—*Sess. xxv. Decretum de Purgat.* p. 286.

Thus you see, my friends, my position is established by the concurrent and unanimous testimony of the fathers of the Church, and of all these ancient and venerable monuments of antiquity. And, according to the testimony of these liturgies, the practice of praying for the dead, in order that they may be loosed from their sins, is most unquestionable. But you must add to this, the uniform, living, resounding voice of the CATHOLIC CHURCH, never ceasing in every age to preach and inculcate the doctrine; calling—most triumphantly calling—by the voice of her disputants in every theological discussion, on their opponents to state the era, the date, when it first arose to contaminate the pure belief of Christians. That is what I again and again call on my friend to do this evening, in order that he may indulge his taste for conjecture as to what period of time this doctrine arose in the world. Whether he will take, upon this occasion, some fanciful period, as he did on the doctrine of Transubstantiation, plunging into one of those convenient dark ages which he knows nothing about; or whether he will condescend to give it a little more antiquity, and to allow that it

sprang up in the fifth or fourth centuries, or in the second; perhaps he may be beneficent enough to do it. I know not what line of argument he will adopt; but certain I am, that he will not dare to look that great argument in the face,—that *triple* argument, I should say, which I bring against him, viz. the liturgies of the Church; the unanimous consent of the fathers *appealing to Scripture*. Mark that! not the fathers alone, but the fathers appealing to Scripture, and the ever-living resounding voice, from age to age, of the CATHOLIC CHURCH. Oh! my friends, I cannot but exclaim, With what eagerness would not my learned friend blot out from his mind for ever all these unpleasing remembrances of *liturgies and fathers!*

I shall now take the liberty of reading you an extract from two books which are rejected since the Reformation. It is the fashion, it appears, to reject them for uncanonicity, though the Catholic Church has received them up to this period from the third Council of Carthage, and received them as canonical in conjunction with others; and though St. Austin and other fathers of the Church quote them as canonical, still my friend, time after time, raises his voice against their authenticity. The first is the book of Maccabees.

2 Maccab. xii. 43, 44, 45, 46.—“The valiant commander having made a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And because he considered, that they who had fallen

asleep with godliness, had had great grace laid up for them. It is, therefore, a wholesome and holy thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.”

And, my friends, having quoted to you this passage, the authenticity of which book I shall endeavour to substantiate this evening by some few remarks, I beg leave to call your attention to this fact—how the whole coincides with other parts of the Testament which my friend does admit. I quote Matthew ii. 36.

Then Corinthians.

Then St. Peter xviii. xix. and xx.

Then Revelations.

Now, my friends, this passage from the Book of Maccabees was too glaring not to dazzle the eyes of the Reformers in the sixteenth century, when they arose up determined to expunge from the belief of the Christian world the doctrine of Purgatory. They said, and they urged it very systematically—“So long as that book stares us in the face, we never can extinguish from the belief of Christians the doctrine of Purgatory.” What, therefore, remained to be done? Why to lop it off, and to hand you down only a part of the Bible; so that those who place their salvation upon the interpretation which they deduce from the Bible, are found in the nineteenth century to have been defrauded of a vital part of the Bible. They say that it was not included in the canon of the Jews, but it was included in the canon of the Council of Carthage by the assembled bishops of the Catholic Church at the Council of Carthage in the fourth century; and it was solemnly declared therein to have been received from the apostles as a really canonical book. It was believed in implicitly by all Christendom, until men of the most

unhallowed daring in the sixteenth century proceeded to expunge it from the belief of Christians. But, my friends, there is one thing certain, and that is, Whether inspired or not, we Catholics most obstinately contend that it is in unison with the voice of ages. There is one thing certain, that my learned friend will not dare to call in question the antiquity of the book; that it was written before the birth of our Saviour many years. And we know very well, as to that objection about the Jewish canon, that since the days of Esdras no books were enumerated. The Council of Carthage, therefore, received them among the number of inspired writings, and the Catholic Church has ever since declared them to be a portion of the inspired writings. And we, therefore, when we argue from Scripture, of course take these as an integral part of Scripture; and if you admit that it is an integral part of Scripture, the question is at an end, and my friend is confounded.

"These are the books"—here are the words of the Council of Carthage, to which I call my friend's particular attention.

Now mark, my friends, in this enumeration are included all the books which Catholics have in their Bibles to this day, not excepting Baruk, which my friend quoted at a lecture after me, which I gave on the Bible some time ago at Hammersmith, before the commencement of this discussion; I, standing with pen in hand, calling to my learned friend for the page whence he had taken the assertion that the Book of Baruk was not inserted in the Council of Carthage. I accordingly read, and could not find it; and when I applied to my reverend friend the other day to answer what it was—it must in-

deed have been a wonderful *lapsus memoriæ*—he said he had not alluded to Baruk! I declare solemnly I took it down as the quotation he mentioned at a subsequent lecture to the one I gave, and I found all the books exactly enumerated, with Baruk included. How this happened I leave to the learned gentleman to explain when he rises. St. Austin gives the same enumeration, and quotes from the Book of Maccabees as canonical Scripture. It was ranked among the Holy Scriptures by Pope Innocent the First, in his reply to Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, in the year 405. It was quoted by him in that celebrated epistle, which is now extant, in the year 400. It was quoted as canonical Scripture by Pope Gelasius, assisted by seven bishops, in a decree of the Roman Council which sat in the year 394. The canonicity, therefore, of this book remains firmly established for ever. And, therefore, when the book of Maccabees declares that it is "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins," I think, gentlemen, it is evidence not to be contradicted by any far-fetched or fanciful interpretation of my friend, which he chooses to give to certain favourite texts which have become familiar to him from his infancy. But again, every learned man throughout Europe admits the two Books of Maccabees to be an authentic history. Protestant divines of the Church of England do; I do not know what they do in Scotland; but Protestant divines of the Church of England admit them to be authentic histories; and the historical fact remains uncontradicted, that in the days of Maccabees the Jews offered sacrifices for the dead. Josephus, the Jew, informs us that the Jews were

not in the habit of praying for those who had committed suicide. Granted; but for whom, therefore, did they pray? Of course they did not pray for those in Abraham's bosom, or for those in hell, for the gates of hell are equally closed against pardon as against all hope; therefore, they must have prayed for those who were in a *medial* state, which we call Purgatory. And here I must call attention to this, because I dare say it will form the substantial part of my friend's argument that the word "Purgatory," or *Purgatorium*, was not much resounded in the early ages. I grant it; but purgatorial *fire* was, which is tantamount, and strongly expresses the pains and torments of the medial state. And, moreover, a man may be a very good Catholic, and never mention the word Purgatory now. Again, our Saviour finding this custom established by the Jews, as appears from the Book of Maccabees, which as a book of history is not to be confuted—our Saviour finding it established, did he ever find fault with the practice, or did he ever reprehend it? Why did he not? He would naturally have exclaimed against it as one of the superstitious traditions of the Jews. Why did not the apostles and evangelists exclaim against it?

Now, my friends, the question naturally occurs as to how these heresies, if they be so, crept into the Jewish Church?—for my learned friend will never deny that the Jews have prayers for the dead in their prayer-books to the present day. It was impossible to expect that, upon turning Christians, the Jews should discontinue to offer up prayers as they did in former times, as we learn from their learned Rabbis—it is impossible, when they came into the Christian Church and were converted, that the apostles

would not reprehend them for bringing heresies into the Church, had they continued such prayers. And I shall thank my friend, when he rises with the fathers in his hand, *to point out some father finding fault with Christians for the superstitious practice of praying for the dead.* It was their bounden duty, as the great champions of Christianity, to have thundered out their denunciations, and to have pointed out for execration so odious, so baneful a heresy, had it been one, as my learned friend most untheologically contends. But no; all the fathers of the Church and all the liturgies cry out with one simultaneous cry—"*Praying for the dead is an apostolical usage.*"

From that text I deduce manifestly, that there are sins to be forgiven in the world to come; and it is not in the power of sound logic to draw any other distinction from it.

Most undoubtedly, as a man departs out of this life he will have to give an account for every idle word uttered. But will my learned Calvinistic friend grant that all sin is so perfectly equal that he may be damned for a single word? He never will do it. I say it is impossible, after Christ has shed his blood, that a man should be plunged into the flames of hell for that. If a man has passed the day idly, or in mere squandering of idle words, he will no doubt have to give his account and be punished. But God forbid that I should ever act on the doctrine of those rigid Christians, who would condemn him to eternal torment! No—but Scripture tells me that I must give an account for them. Is he to be applauded for them? No; undoubtedly he is to be punished for them. Again, I quote that celebrated passage, which I dare say

will afford unbounded scope to the luxuriance of the oriental fancy of my learned friend.

Now, I acknowledge that the first part of this the fathers have interpreted variously. I must also interpret it differently from them, which I am at liberty to do. But on the great article of Purgatory, there it is that all the fathers of the Church combine, as well as all the liturgies; and I deduce from them the doctrine which that Church itself has never ceased to resound in her sacred temples—that “some may be saved, yet so as by fire,” meaning, that some may be saved in the other world, if not in this. Had it been otherwise, my friends, how unjust it would be!—[Here the learned gentleman closed abruptly: time expiring.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—There are two ways, my friends, in which a man may endeavour to persuade you that he pursues a logical and conclusive course in bringing his positions to what he thinks a triumphant issue. He may reason forcibly, prove his views, and defy his opponent to impugn or controvert them. Or he may talk a great deal upon the importance of logic, on the necessity of avoiding figures, “orientalisms,” circumlocutions, and metaphors, &c. &c. &c.; and by such a display of mere moonshine, he may lead some individuals, who are wholly dazzled by glitter, or confounded by hard names, to believe that he has perpetrated a whole volume of acute and glorious logic. Now, I admit that if this last be *reasoning*, my opponent has excelled in it to a most surpassing and unprecedented degree. He has enlarged for a whole half-hour on logic, on solid argument, and the importance of close reasoning; and declared that he was treating the

matter with the utmost intellectual power and the shrewdest acumen, well knowing that if he did not tell you, you would not discover it. After all the bustle and babbling, you find that his reasoning and his logic are just what I anticipated they would be—a *vox et præterea nihil*. *Montes parturiunt gignetur ridiculus mus*.

After some preliminary extracts taken from Bossuet, he, contrary to custom, condescended, you observe, to quote from the canons of the Council of Trent; but, according to custom, left out what he found not likely to further his cause. Really it is neither honest, right, nor becoming in my learned opponent to quote fragments only, and leave other fragments unnoticed; therefore, I think it is but fair towards the fathers of the Council of Trent, and but just to the tenet of Purgatory, that I should *read on* from where my learned opponent was pleased to *leave off* in quoting the decree. I shall, therefore, read it to you. My cautious opponent concluded at the words “*filthy lucre*;” “but,” continues the decree, “let the bishop take care.”

You observe, this will be found a *profitable* rider to the decree, because, if this were left out, there might be no profit realised from Purgatory; and, instead of its being a valuable mine from which golden ore might be dug “for the maintenance of the faithful,” it might turn out to be a mere figment, unproductive as it is unscriptural and irrational. “Let them take care,” says the decree, “that the suffrages of faithful men, to wit, the sacrifices at masses, prayers, alms-giving, and other works of piety, which have been accustomed to be made by the faithful for the faithful departed, be piously and devoutly performed, and let those which are due for them

by the wills of founders be discharged by the priests," &c.

This distinction I wish you to keep before you, that *praying for the dead is one thing, and Purgatory is another*; as my antagonist seems to think that the one involves the other.

Now, my learned opponent has brought forward many facts from the fathers, and from the liturgies (of which I have a little to say by-and-by), in all of which there seemed to be the far-distant and shadowy beaming of an idea (for it is sometimes difficult to extract from the *verbiage* with which they are shrouded the real sentiments of the fathers) that prayers were offered for the faithful dead in ancient times. He may or may not prove this; but remember, this is not the question. I think praying for the happy dead is an unscriptural act; but, in my mind, there is just as wide a distinction between praying for departed saints and purgatory, as there is between black and white, or any two extremes whatever. I certainly can conceive an individual to pray for those saints who are dead, that the day of their full and final happiness may speedily dawn—although I would not do so, for I think it is unscriptural—yet I can conceive an individual to do so, while at the same time he never dreams of or perpetrates the monstrous idea that in some particular region of the earth, or moon, or anywhere else the sapient fathers may determine, there is a region, where “by fire,” as my friend quoted it, “those saints who die in venial sins are purified by fire from those sins,” and are made meet for immortality and glory. You observe, the extracts read by my opponent go to show, that it is the souls of the *pious*—of the *faithful*—of the *ransomed* that enter Purgatory. Now, whatever the torments that may be en-

dured in purgatorial fire—whatever purifying inflictions and penal chastisements may be there, you are to keep fixed in your mind the fact, that it is *not* condemned sinners who, according to the Roman Church, suffer there, *but those who have* “washed their robes” in the blood of the Lamb; those that are justified by Christ’s righteousness—the ransomed and redeemed, “as by the precious blood of the Lamb.” These two points I wish you to retain before you—first, that *there is a palpable distinction between Purgatory and praying for the pious dead*; and, in the next place, that, according to Rome, *it is the souls of the righteous, the redeemed, that enter into Purgatory*, and become subjected to those purifying processes and penal torments which may be contained in the definition of the word “Purgatory.” My opponent recurred to his twenty-times-repeated *crambe recolta* of our genealogy or Protestant lineage. He has given us some curious specimens of it, doubtless, in the course of this controversy. Popery is so ingrained in my opponent, that, because he has a pope, he thinks every one else must have one too. He traced first every Protestant to Calvin. Then he was not satisfied with that, but thinking it would gratify us, he traced it a little further backward, till he brought us up to Luther as our pope or father. But, it seems, not satisfied with that sketch of his antiquarian charity, he took us a little further back, and linked our parentage with the Jews who disbelieved Christianity, and who also disbelieved, as he says, Transubstantiation; but now he seems to repent his kindness, slips aside in a most dexterous way, and says he will not allow our parentage to extend beyond the fourth century, and, whether I will or not, *Ærius* is my

parent and prototype. I had the honour of being a descendant of Julian the Apostate last evening, and now I have the honour of a descent from Ærius—the Socinian Ærius. Does not this show a woful want of argument? I have no need of such resources—“*non tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis.*” But as for himself, most illustrious Hector! he comes under the banner of the fathers. I will show you, before I have done with them, that if ever there was a motley banner, if ever there was “a coat of many colours,” it is this same banner of the fathers under which my opponent advances, brandishing his spear like a weaver’s beam—magniloquently prosy.

But I protest against the charge that I come under the banner of Ærius. I never saw him. I never read his writings. I come like David to meet the papal Goliath with his clerical shield and sword-bearers, “in the name of the Lord of Hosts,” not in the name of Ærius, or Julian, pope, inquisitor, or priest, nor under the auspices of any of the best or brightest of the names of mankind.

My opponent next introduced a quotation, which I find is from Tertullian, one of the fathers under whose banner he comes. But while quoting, he most ingenuously admitted that he *was a heretic*. Yet he comes under his banner!—a heretic’s banner! A “defender of the faith,” quoting from Tertullian in support of Purgatory, whom in the very next breath he acknowledges had erred in fundamental truth, and whom he pronounces to be a heretic! March on amid the folds of this ignoble banner—any means will do.

He next stated that I met the doctrine of Purgatory only on the battle-field of Scripture; and he was

right in saying so. I meet it and master it on that field from which he shrinks, viz. the word of the living God. If unscriptural, he said, I must admit that the doctrine of Purgatory was *very old*! Yes; like a variety of bad practices or worse principles in this fallen world, it is very old. It is delineated, and at length, in the sixth book of the Æneid of Virgil, where I find a much more beautiful description of Purgatory than Bossuet gives, in the classical lines of the Latin poet. I have also read the same doctrine in the pages of Plato; and, therefore, I give my friend credit for his statement that it is “very old,” since it was known, invented, and believed by the ancient heathens, long before it was enrolled in the eclipse of the third and fourth centuries among the tenets of truth, as we shall afterwards see to be truth.

His next quotation was respecting a clergyman who had, perhaps, been getting into his dotage, and over whom the bishop was not exercising due episcopal control, who had so far forgotten the Thirty-nine Articles, as to pray for the soul of George the Fourth, after that monarch was dead. All that I can say is, that that clergyman did a very foolish thing.

His next remark was, that if Purgatory be unscriptural, how comes it to pass (and this is one of my opponent’s favourite positions) that the Nestorians and Eutychians, and heretics of various countries, seem to have carried away this “leaven,” mixed up with various other tenets which they had imbibed from the Church of Rome? is not this a proof of its inspiration? My reply is, that we are not without parallel phenomena. How came it that the Samaritans, who separated from the Jewish Church, carried away the practice of idolatry as it

prevailed in the Jewish Church? Is it to be for a moment supposed that because the Samaritans became idolatrous, that therefore idolatry was a primitive, and patriarchal, and inspired institution? How came it to pass that the ten tribes also carried away the same idolatrous custom which had been brought in by the two tribes? Suppose that in the days of our Lord, finding the two tribes guilty of idolatry, and finding that the ten tribes had lapsed into the very same—suppose that one of the apostles was reasoning with the Jews, and the Jews had replied, “Why, if this be idolatry, if it be not sanctioned by God, how happens it that the very same dogma is cherished by the ten tribes, the Samaritans, and others?” What would be the reply? Why, “By their traditions both have made void the commandments of God,” by losing sight of the sacred oracles; and they have lapsed into all those monstrous consequences which must in such circumstances necessarily follow. The proper question is, What saith the Scripture?—“How readest thou?”

His next remark was in reference to some authors that he quoted, who seemed to hold Purgatory; and, among others, he mentioned Bishop Bull. Now I much question the charge. I am certain it is unfounded. But, with me, the great question is, as I have repeated over and over again, not what Bishop Bull says, or what Thorndyke says; but “To the law and to the testimony.” And whether it be Bishop Bull, or the Pope, or Mr. French, who says so, I say it is not to be regarded for a moment, and I have again and again repeated the great truth; and I rejoice to have before me, by-and-by, an opportunity of proving that the rule of faith among Protestants, in the

words of the eminent Chillingworth, a name that ought to be dear to every one, and whose writings ought to be “like household words” among you—“*the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.*” And, (as it is now suggested to me) if one of the clergy of the Church of England be believed to favour any particular dogma of the Church of Rome, there are ten thousand clergy who just state the reverse. And, therefore, if my antagonist bring one for his tenet, I bring ten thousand against him. But I will show you that one distinguished name, high in rank in the Church of Rome, and no mean authority, disclaims the doctrine of Purgatory wholly. And I will, moreover, show you that many of the authorities to whom he appeals with great confidence, really never seem to have dreamt of Purgatory; that others, who in their hallucinations countenanced such a tenet, seem to have plunged into the most extravagant whims about its nature and locality, its use, and its necessary results.

The next question he has asked is, Why did not the apostles and evangelists protest against Purgatory? Now my simple reply, by way of interrogatory, is, Why did they not protest against Mahometanism, or Southcotianism, or Owenism?—Why did they not protest against certain doctrines introduced at subsequent eras? But, at the same time, I maintain that the apostles and evangelists employ language which goes alone and distinctly to demolish the whole fabric and foundation of Purgatory. For instance: the apostle says, in 2 Cor. v. 1: “For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have”—*what to go to?* Purgatorial fire? No; but “a building of God, a house not made

with hands, eternal in the heavens." And again the apostle says, in the very same epistle, the sixth, seventh, and eighth verses of this same chapter—"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, to be present with the Lord." You observe, the apostle here distinctly declares, that when a believer is "*absent from the body,*" he is "*present with the Lord;*" but the theology of the Church of Rome is, that when a believer is "*absent from the body,*" he is *present with purgatorial fires*. This surely is a virtual protest against all that is involved in Purgatory. The views of the Church of Rome and those of the apostles in the after results of death never can be reconciled even by my opponent's marvellous logic.

Before I enter on the scriptural argument, however, I must refer to the importance that is to be attributed to those extracts my opponent has with such ridiculous assumptions brought forward from the liturgies, and other post-apostolic documents. Now, let me observe, before referring to Dupin, from whom I have already quoted so amply, in order more clearly to illustrate the worth or weight of these liturgies even by the Roman doctors—let me observe, that my learned opponent, with a peculiar and characteristic contempt for the authority of his church, or for its most distinguished divines, when either dares to dispute his *ipse dixit*, thinks nothing of casting overboard either fathers, or doctors, or cardinals, or all who dare for a moment to concur with me in thinking his logic wordiness and pithless pomposity. Every one in this as-

sembly will recollect that when I quoted a passage from St. Augustine, whom he had almost adored, in order to neutralize another sentiment of the same father, what was the reply of my antagonist?—"Well, if St. Augustine says so and so, I beg to differ with him." And when I quoted from the acute Professor Delahogue, he cast him away, as not worthy of a moment's retention. When I quoted Thomas Aquinas, whom he requested me to read, and whose poetry he so strongly commended to my attention as a terse and beautiful epitome of Roman Catholic theology, it happened that when I read Aquinas in my leisure hours at home from his "*Secunda Secundæ*," I found that he inculcated the most sanguinary and murderous opinions; and though a saint, with his collect in the Missal, yet my opponent sweeps him overboard. He has thus been slipping step by step from the Vatican; and I believe, before I have done with my learned opponent, that he will renounce the whole group of fathers, doctors, cardinals, and popes, and that he will come to the *truly and only primitive*, the truly and *only ancient* apostolical faith, which is contained within the boards of this most blessed book, so shunned, and so disliked, and so assailed by my opponent on every question we discuss. Now, at last, we find Dupin must go with the rest of the great historians, at the kick of this most learned counsellor. I would just observe, that when I quoted this Roman Catholic historian, my reason for doing so was simply this: if I had taken Mosheim or Milner, or any other Protestant historian, the reply of my antagonist would instantly have been—"Oh! a Protestant historian! his words are worth nothing. There is truth only in Roman documents." Well; in

order to avoid the possibility of any such charge, I singled out the most distinguished historian of this huge monopoly of truth, or rather falsehood, the Roman Catholic Church—a man, whose industry and genius are universally admitted, whose works have been held as established authority—a man whose merits have been canvassed by the severest literary criticism, and on whom *eulogia* broad and bright have again and again been pronounced. I singled out Dupin, I say, the most distinguished authority in the Roman Catholic Church, and after I had brought forward his authoritative statements, his indestructible proofs that these liturgies were forgeries and legends,—proofs, remember, *per se* conclusive even if Balaam's ass should utter them—he was then pleased to say, “Oh, Dupin was cited by Bossuet before the Archbishop of Paris, and was obliged to make an apology for his writings.” It was so. Bossuet was no more the Church of Rome than Mr. French. But was the Archbishop of Paris the Romish Church? If a dozen archbishops had condemned him, as they probably would have done, this would not lessen the authority of this able Roman Catholic historian, who had the moral heroism to think and speak. But was not every advocate of truth and antagonist of the papacy who dared at that period to whisper a suspicion against the pretensions of that Church, and who was found under its authority or within its range of jurisdiction, obliged to make an apology likewise? Is it not true, that GALILEO was obliged to make an apology for stating the great astronomical truth, that the earth moved round the sun? But because popes and cardinals made Galileo recant and tarnish his fame, does the *fact* cease to be true that

the earth revolves round the sun? or did the sun and earth exchange places at his holiness's bidding?

And if Dupin was obliged to make an apology to an archbishop for stating the truth, does truth cease to be truth, because suppressed or overcome by the temporal force and coercive anathemas of an abominable inquisition? Truth continues truth when its advocates are thrown to the wild beasts, or its ministers burned as martyrs. Does it at all follow that Dupin did not speak the truth, because he was obliged to say, “He was sorry that he had offended against the Church of Rome, or touched its mercenary interests, or trod upon its sorest and its tenderest toe?” [Laughter.] I find here in a biographical notice I have got of Dupin, that the *grave* charge against him was just what I anticipated—that some of the sentiments contained in his work were “injurious to the Holy Apostolic See!” I indeed admit that his statements are thus injurious—not because Dupin was dishonest, but because Rome was corrupt. Certainly, where his arguments relate to that most delicate subject, they do most signally show the recency of all of those superstitious dogmas, which were palmed on the Christian church by credulous monks in the lapse of ages. The sticklers for Romanism cannot relish an honest Roman Catholic; and it certainly was the most convenient, though I question whether it was the most honest course for my opponent to adopt, namely, to apportion Dupin a place with Augustine, Delahogue, and others, whom, when they contradicted him, without the least hesitation he kicked out of his presence as unfit witnesses for the purity and truth of the Roman Catholic faith. But let me repeat, I rest all the arguments against the

spurious liturgies which I brought forward, especially against that of St. James, *not on the CREDIT OF DUPIN*, but on *THE FACTS AND ARGUMENTS* which Dupin adduces. Let my opponent *meet these*: any body can canvass facts. If Satan, my friends, were to bring forward a solid argument, and thus eclipse my opponent, that argument would be good, even though Satan may have uttered it; and therefore, whatever be the *worth of the name of Dupin*, in connexion with the communion of which he was a subject, the *arguments and facts* which he adduces to disprove the liturgy of St. James.

MR. FRENCH.—*James!* Did you say James?

REV. J. CUMMING.—Yes, St. James?

MR. FRENCH.—You said, the last time, *Peter*.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I said James: but I will give you Dupin's solid refutation of the liturgy of St. Peter too, which is quite on a par with that of St. James. That of St. James was the liturgy I quoted to-night.

MR. FRENCH.—You denied it.

REV. J. CUMMING.—[*in continuation*].—As my opponent builds his forlorn hopes on these, I must yet further show you what disproofs of authenticity and genuineness the liturgy of St. James really contains, and what is the precise value, authority, and theological importance to be attached to this liturgy of St. James in determining the question. I take its own internal evidence—irresistible evidence, furnished by itself, and so palpable that common sense must pronounce it an impudent forgery. Now, remember, my opponent has stated that these liturgies testify in favour of Purgatory, and that therefore the doctrine must be necessarily true. I can show by

some extracts from this *spurious document* that the passages he read scarcely, nay, do not at all reach the doctrine of Purgatory, as defined in the standards of the Roman Church. I admit that there are expressions employed in it which seem to involve the embryo of Purgatory, but not to prove or establish it.

But for proofs of the forgery: in the liturgy of St. James, the Virgin Mary is called "the Mother of God," a term utterly unknown in St. James's time! And, therefore, the fact appears to be, that "coming events must have cast their shadows before;" as St. James must have been writing about events not then come, or the liturgy must have been written subsequently to the time of this distinction. Observe also, that these liturgies contain points of doctrinal principle and practice that would have been made use of in the edicts and controversies waged in the Council of Nice; they were too valuable to be passed over, and yet these points are not once alluded to by that Council. Mary is called the Mother of God, and the Holy Ghost is in this liturgy declared to be consubstantial with the Son. If the members of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus had known these to be the words of St. James, assuredly they would have quoted them. We find in this liturgy the doxology and the trisagion, or *sanctus* and *gloria patri*, which were not used or generally recognised in these forms in the Church till the fifth century. The introduction of these formulas shows that the liturgy is the *accumulation of five centuries*, not the production of St. James.

In this same liturgy we also find collects for those persons who were shut up in monasteries and convents. However common these institutions may be now, no Roman Catholic will venture to assert that

they were instituted and organized in the days of the apostles. Do we read one syllable about *monasteries* in the writings of the Apostle St. James? The Roman Catholic Church must herself admit there were no monasteries in existence in the days of the apostles. In the fourth place, there is an account of the functionaries called "confessors," a term which Bellarmine admits to have been unknown in St. James's days. This admission alone of the distinguished cardinal is fatal.

In the fifth place, in the liturgy of St. James mention is made of "incense and altars." Can it be imagined that these things were used in the days of St. James?—Not a whisper about it in the word of God; one only altar is there—Christ.

In the sixth place, we find many quotations from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul; not in one place, where it might be admitted a slight interpolation had occurred, but repeatedly, in various places, and in various formulas of devotion. Observe, then, in these same liturgies we find quotations from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul; and these epistles (from which the quotations are taken) were *actually written after James* had been gathered to a better and a brighter world. The whole texture and ceremonial of these liturgies are foreign to the days of St. James, and so palpable are the evidences of forgery, that the ablest defenders of their genuineness must admit the grossest interpolations. Cardinals Bona and Bellarmine confess that certain things have been inserted subsequently; and who can say, if these were tampered with in this way, that Purgatory might not have been inserted, as well as the Mass and Transubstantiation? So that I think there is sufficient evidence to prove that there is not one

of these liturgies which ought not to be crossed and inscribed with forgery. I not only dispute the assertion of my opponent, that Purgatory is actually recognised in these liturgies, but I do also maintain, from evidence no ingenuous mind can resist, that these liturgies are spurious; that they are the forgeries of a far later age; that St. James never wrote, as far as we can see, one particle of them; and that those evidences which I have submitted of their forged and spurious character depend not on my own *ipse dixit*, or upon the credit and weight of the historians who gave them, but on indestructible fact. On one single point I call on my opponent to meet and explain, namely, by what extraordinary magic, by what unprecedented process unrecorded and unknown to us, by what new miracle, St. James came down from heaven to earth and composed his liturgies, quoting from the Epistles of St. Paul, which were written after his death, and yet has left the impression that all were composed before he died. It will require a miracle to substantiate these phenomena. It will beat Transubstantiation. You can adduce from the Bollandists hundreds of miracles, and surely you will find therein that St. James appeared at least three hundred years after his death, walked on our world, and was pleased to compose and *impose* these liturgies, for the sake of giving the Church of Rome, and my friend Mr. French, an opportunity of demonstrating that the doctrine of Purgatory was an apostolical and a Christian practice. If Transubstantiation shakes the credibility of the resurrection, this will shake the credibility of the apostles; but it will help the Pope. Of this I am abundantly convinced: that the remark of Chillingworth is the

feeling of every sound inquirer:—"For my part, after a long, and as I verily believe and hope, impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, I do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my feet but upon this rock only, viz. the Scripture. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, councils against councils; some fathers against others; the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; and the church of one age against the church of another age." "The Scripture," says Sherlock, "is all of a piece, every part of it agrees with the rest; the fathers many times contradict themselves and each other. It has often made me smile with a mixture of pity and indignation to see what a great noise the Roman disputants make among women and children with quotations out of the fathers and councils, whom they pretend to be all on their side." I wish my opponent to cleave to Scripture only; but, as he shrinks from Scripture, I must thus shake beneath his feet the only ground he attempts to totter on—the *liturgies and the fathers*. It has been easily done.

Now I told you on a former occasion, that I was most anxious for their own sake to allow the fathers to slumber in their tombs and their ashes undisturbed. My opponent, however, will expose them. I am truly grieved to see these poor mutilated and interpolated fathers dragged before an assembly of reasonable men by a plunging "defender of the faith" at his wit's end—their contradictions, their infirmities, and their errors—theirs by imputation, not merit—their monstrous and extravagant fancies, woven into their texture at posterior epochs and by dishonest priests

during the dark and "iron ages," brought forward and exposed before this assembly. But my opponent must patch up Purgatory even at the risk of exposing the fathers. But how will this assembly marvel when I announce THAT WE HAVE NOT THE FATHERS of the Christian church! I referred to Delahogue, Professor of Theology at Maynooth, on a former occasion, and we found that he states most correctly that "*the fathers in the first and second centuries were much better employed than in writing books—that they were busy in preparing their followers and sons for martyrdom.*" So that we have the sentiments of only a handful of the fathers of Christendom, as a handful only wrote; and of this handful of writers we have only *some fragments*, which have been handed down to us in the writings of Eusebius and others. And, therefore, if we have not *all*, nor even a majority of the early fathers, we may be at perfect liberty to presume that the writings of the majority, if they had written, would have embodied doctrines the very antipodes of those which Mr. French has quoted. He gives us the so-called sentiments of a minority. But as we have not the writings even of that small minority entire, as we have only fragments, and these interpolated fragments; a mass of mosaic work arranged and consolidated by *interested parties*; it is unfair and *ungenerous to the dead*, to take their mutilated remains and torture these to support any assumed doctrine of the Roman Church. In order the better to show you this fact, I quote chap. xxvii. book v. of the *Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius*: "Numerous works, indeed, of ancient ecclesiastical writers are still preserved by many, the monuments of a virtuous industry. Those which

we would select of them might be the commentaries of Heraclitus on the Apostle, the works of Massinas, &c., with many others of whom, as we have no data, we can neither insert the times nor any data. Innumerable others there are also that have come down to us, even the names of whom it would be impossible to give. All of these were orthodox and ecclesiastical writers, as the interpretation which each gives of the sacred Scriptures shows you, but they are not known to us because the works themselves do not give their authors." If we join this extract with the former taken from Delahogue, we have very decisive testimony on the claims of the fathers we possess. Much of the writings of the ancient fathers and others at present are lost, and the remainder have too evidently been in the alembics of Rome. DUPIN says, also, "For the most part those authors and their works, which were more ancient than Eusebius, have been lost since his death by the injury of time, and therefore we are mightily obliged to him who hath preserved in his history not only the memory of these authors, but some considerable fragments of their works. In short, without the history of Eusebius we should scarcely have any knowledge, not only of the history of those first ages of the Church, but even of the authors that wrote at that time and their works, since no other author but he has given an account of these things."

The most part of the authors and writings of the first two centuries, as Dupin observes, are now lost, and are also unknown. And it is really a perfect insult to the fathers to bring forward from time to time mere mutilated fragments, excessively vitiated and corrupted, and then to say that these fragments

are representative announcements of the actual sentiments of *all* the fathers in the first and second centuries. We have not even a *catena patrum*, much less a *confusion*, of their united and unanimous faith. My plan has been throughout, you will observe, however, to leave the fathers as sources of authority, and to go to the apostles and evangelists: and with infinite reason, since I have shown you, by facts and extracts, evidence the most abundant and incontrovertible, that the fathers contradict each other; one father himself in the same work; and another father another, even by the admission of Cardinal Bellarmine, as well as of my learned opponent. I have brought forward Augustine saying one thing, and my friend has brought forward Augustine saying another precisely opposite; at last, so out of humour did he grow with the fathers, that the only way in which he could treat this "*Patrum concordia discors*" was, notwithstanding his previous idolizing of the "glorious Augustine," by observing with exquisite naïveté, "*I beg leave to differ from Augustine.*" I brought forward the deliberate opinion of Dupin, the Roman Catholic historian, about St. Jerome, wherein he stated that St. Jerome was a man of an "extravagant and heated fancy," and that "much credit was not to be attached to his opinions;" and so incensed did my opponent become with the worthy historian, that, along with many other mighty Goliaths, he has thrown Dupin overboard, and will not endure his opinion of St. Jerome. Well; I have all sorts of prescriptions. I brought forward the opinion of a *Roman Catholic*, which, though fortified with arguments, he set at nought. I now bring forward the opinion of a *Protestant*. As he rejects the historians of his

own Church, perhaps he will be kind enough to admit one of the historians of our Church. If he reject every one, he must be the pope *incog.* Mosheim, notwithstanding he has the misfortune to be a Protestant, speaks the truth. I, therefore, quote Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," from the fourth century, and in the following words, a Protestant estimate of Jerome, and of my opponent's redoubted and most harmonious fathers.

"His complexion was excessively warm and choleric; his bitterness against those who differed with him extremely keen, and his thirst of glory insatiable. He was so prone to censure, that several persons whose lives were not only irreproachable, but even exemplary, became the objects of his unjust accusations. All this, joined to his superstitious turn of mind, and the enthusiastic encomiums which he lavished upon a false and degenerate sort of piety which prevailed in his time, sunk his reputation greatly, and that even in the esteem of the candid and wise."

In another part of the same account, Mosheim says, with great plainness but truth, that "he was the foul-mouthed Jerome."

So you observe, when I refer to the writings of Dupin, St. Jerome is spoken of in the most contemptuous and depreciating terms. When I refer to Mosheim, he is spoken of in the same depreciatory manner. And now I refer to "the glorious" St. Augustine, so often quoted by my opponent. Augustine says, writing of St. Jerome, that "he was unsteady, and that many of his statements in his commentaries on the writings of St. Paul were wrong." Augustine also records that St. Jerome, amid his other vagaries, such as Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and so on, stated that

there were "officious lies in the Bible;" and St. Augustine writes like a Christian and honest man, and remonstrates against the impious sentiment. "Therefore," says St. Augustine, "assume your recantation."

Observe: one father calling most unanimously on another father to *recant!* Mark, my Roman Catholic hearers, the beautiful harmony and *unanimity!* among the fathers; and yet neither you nor your defender dare interpret one text or passage of Scripture until you have found the palpable nonentity, the unanimity of the fathers. Now you see here is one father most boldly calling on another father "to sing his recantation." [Laughter.] Nor is it to be wondered at that Augustine should thus adjure St. Jerome to recant. The wonder is that the Church of Rome, hard as she is driven, should have recourse to such trash; should cling to "*defensoribus istis—tali auxilio.*"

You have in many of the extracts I refer to the verdict of the "glorious Augustine" upon the sentiments of St. Jerome, viz. that he preached the most infamous and pestilential notions that any individual could possibly imagine, such as "that the epistles which he wrote were inspired by the Spirit," and "that God had told officious lies." You have next the verdict of Dupin that "he was a man of heated and choleric imagination; that he was a writer and disputant of bitter disposition and temperament, and that he said many things chargeable with orientalism. That he imagined the stars had souls; that he called fancies *facts*, and made facts fancies, and called the production of his own heated brain the inspiration of God. You have had Mosheim pronounce precisely the same verdict upon Jerome. And,

therefore, I contend that my friend, so far as St. Jerome goes, is bound to hide his head ashamed; that he is bound to be mute on the unanimity of one or all of the fathers of the Church, and that he ought to leave St. Jerome at rest (hoping that he held the one faith) in heaven, and his ashes in the grave; for, according to St. Augustine, he is no ornament to his Church, nor to any other. In the next place, I must say, that my friend has given you his *own* interpretation of the liturgies and fathers; but I exceedingly question the accuracy of my friend's interpretation from the specimen which he gave us the other evening on the Invocation of Saints. I really believe he has the most happy knack of any man I ever saw of extracting something out of nothing, and of proving that because a book is not a stone, therefore, a stone must be a book. You observe he asserted that, according to our interpretation, "worship" is applied to God and to man, and that it is to be distinguished in this way, viz. that *pure religious worship* is to be given to God, and *civil* homage only to man, and my learned opponent brought forward a long string of passages which bore nothing on the subject in any shape, or sense, or form. In one of them he insisted we were called upon to worship God's "footstool." Now, if we grant, for argument's sake, that the rendering is "footstool," and not "at his footstool," and that the word "worship" must mean religious worship or religious service; observe the magnificent results this theory will lead to. It is recorded in Gen. xxiii. 7, that "Abraham fell down and worshipped the children of Heth," that is, the idolatrous descendants of Cain. If "worshipping" in the passages

quoted by my opponent means giving *religious service*, then we have here a patriarch giving religious worship to the idolatrous descendants of Cain. But I must advance a little further. I deduce from my opponent's quotation from Psalm xcix. the conviction that my learned opponent is either grossly disingenuous and dishonest, which I will not believe, or I must think that he is utterly ignorant of the Hebrew language; one or the other I must distinctly charge him with. When he quoted the ninety-ninth Psalm, ver. 5, he said, he also brought it forward as a specimen of our mistranslation of the Bible. He stated that it was "Exalt ye the Lord, *and worship his footstool.*" Now I have the Hebrew words. I have brought my Hebrew Bible this evening, and I find the original Hebrew.

רוֹקְמוּ דָּהָר אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לַחֹדֶם רַגְלָיו

Translated literally, is, "Exalt ye Jehovah our God, and bow down *at* (or *BESIDE*) the stool of his feet." My friend, if he knew Hebrew, would know perfectly well that *hados* has the prefix preposition *lamed*; and this prefix preposition signifies *beside* or *near*, or *in the neighbourhood of*, or *before*, or *upon*. Now, as in the Hebrew the word is *Lahadom* with the prefix attached to it, no man acquainted with the rudiments of Hebrew would expose himself as my learned opponent has done. But it is time to leave the doctrine of the invocation theoretically, but practically idolatry, of the saints in the catastrophe in which we have lodged it, and also the too transparent sophistry in which my opponent has decked it—its shroud rather than its vindication—and address ourselves to sending Purgatory after it. On Pur-

gatory, says my opponent, all the fathers are unanimous. This will indeed be a miracle if true. Let me take the first specimen at hand of the "unanimity of the fathers," upon one of the most common and confided in passages and props urged by Roman Catholics in favour of the tenet of Purgatory. I hold in my hand the first volume of the writings of Bellarmine. You will recollect that my friend holds the fathers are all unanimous on Purgatory. Now I shall not merely take Bellarmine's authority, but refer to the chapter and verse which Bellarmine quotes, and you will find a fair sample of the contradictory expositions presented by the fathers on Purgatory. On the first Epistle of Corinthians, iii. 11, he says: "Let us try diligently to explain this position;" and he makes these remarks:—"There are five difficulties in this place: first, what is understood by the builders. Second, what is meant by gold, silver, precious stones. Third, what is meant by 'day of the Lord.' Fourth, what is understood by the fire. Fifth, what is meant by 'so as by fire.'" For the first, the ARCHITECTS or builders, AUGUSTINE thinks that all Christians are called builders. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius concur with him. Here are five fathers holding this opinion.

"Very many others think that doctors and preachers only are meant; such as St. Ambrose, St. Sedulius, St. Jerome, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and more modern writers, Dionysius, Carthusianus, Lyranus, Cajetan, and others." Here is one batch right against another; St. Ambrose at war with St. Augustine, and St. Jerome pitched against St. Chrysostom. But so little weight had even these fathers with Bellarmine, that, like

my learned opponent, that yet more learned cardinal was pleased to differ from them all, and to hazard a construction of his own. This is a full illustration of the glorious unity that subsists in the realms of infallibility, and of the unanimity of the fathers, without which no Roman Catholic dare venture to interpret the meaning of a text. "The other difficulty," adds the cardinal, "is a little more doubtful, for there are no less than *six* opinions about it." As to the meaning of the foundation and of the superstructure, gold, silver, precious stones, St. Theophylact and St. Chrysostom understand by the foundation true but weak faith; by gold, silver, and precious stones, good works; and by hay, and wood, mortal sins. The cardinal then, right and left, and without mercy, attacks the fathers who differ from him. He says, "This opinion of these two fathers is literally indefensible;" and adds, "It would prove the HERESY of Origen!" Let it be remembered that Origen is one of the "glorious fathers," "the lights of primitive antiquity," "the solid doctors whose names frighten one;" and yet Bellarmine does not scruple to call Origen a *heretic*, and his doctrine heresy.

"The next opinion is, that by foundation is understood Christ; by the name of gold and silver, and precious stones, Catholic interpretations, and by hay and stubble, heresies. St. Ambrose and St. Jerome seem to teach this. This opinion is indefensible." We have then the advocate of the third and fourth opinions; and, lastly, Theodoret and Œcumenius holding a fifth, and both receiving refutation from St. Chrysostom.

After Cardinal Bellarmine had stated that such and such are the opinions of Theodoret, Œcumenius,

and Chrysostom, and that the reverse are the opinions of Augustine, and Origen, and Chrysostom; that is, had presented three battalions of fathers pitted against each other; holding sentiments different from each other, and different from themselves on the same point, this cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church most majestically casts them *all* overboard with the most sovereign contempt.

"When Greek meets Greek then comes the tug of war."

In the next place, the cardinal observes, (lib. iv. cap. iv. *De Purgatorio*) there is a third difficulty about the day of the Lord. On this point, he says, Augustine and Gregory hold one view; but one *flaw* in their view is this only, that "it is against St. Paul!" Why, my antagonist has reiterated that the fathers were unanimous in their interpretation of the apostle Paul! but even a distinguished cardinal of his own Church says, that the opinion of the "glorious" Augustine and the opinion of Gregory the pope are both opposed on this passage to the doctrine of the apostle Paul. Now what think you of the fathers, my Roman Catholic friends, not when you hear a "Calvinist," but a cardinal of your own Church asserting, that they are arrayed, not merely one against another, but the most distinguished of them against the apostle Paul? I told you, long ago, that they were against the apostle Paul. You will not believe me; will you believe a cardinal of the greatest authority in your own Church, when he tells you the very same thing?

"And then the fourth difficulty is, what is the fire that will prove it?" Augustine and Gregory understand the tribulations of this life; others think it is the fire of Purgatory.

He then addresses himself to the

fifth difficulty, and after ransacking all the fathers, and feeling more puzzled than when he began, he, most Protestant-like, starts his own view, and most Romish-like, pronounces it alone right.

If Roman Catholics would well read their own doctors, not distilled in the Jesuitical pages of Bossuet or Milner, but as they write in their own pages, they would be convinced that their Church is befooling and deceiving them, when she declares all to be unity in her, and in other communions only diversity and discord.

Now, on this passage, the stronghold of Purgatory, we have on the one hand Augustine and Gregory, matched against Chrysostom and Theophylact on the other, and these two last pitted against Mr. French and the whole Roman Catholic Church; and yet all the fathers are honourable men and unanimous, and the Roman Church an infallible Church. Now here we have the fathers against the pope, and the pope against the fathers! Here is Mr. French again against the fathers, and the fathers fighting against him, and both together against the pope; and really, if ever there was a perfect *olla podrida*, a genuine hodge-podge of contradictory opinions, it is to be found in the fellowship of these fathers. [Laughter.] It is, my friends, so important to show up these fathers, and to drive Roman Catholics from "such unstable refugees," that I must enlarge a little further. I know my opponent's forlorn hope, and therefore I blast it before it blooms. Bellarmine quotes the next proof of Purgatory from 1 Cor. xv. 29, "Who are baptized for the dead." Now on this passage, which my friend has brought forward wherewith to substantiate Purgatory, we find, as usual, among the fathers, just six

different opinions; and if we found only two, this want of unanimity, according to the second article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., shuts his mouth on the interpretation of it.

"I find six opinions," says Bellarmine. "The *first* is supported by Tertullian, Ambrose, Anselm, and others; but this is not true."

The *second* is by Sedulius and St. Thomas.

The *third* is that of Chrysostom, Ecumenius and Theophylact.

The *fourth* is by Theodoret and Cajetan.

The *fifth* is that of Epiphanius.

The *sixth*, of Ephrem, and this last is the most true. This is unanimity!

The cardinal introduces the third great prop of Purgatory, and Mr. French referred to it, also, as decisive:

Matt. v. 25.—"Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

Chrysostom gives, according to Bellarmine, an interpretation "which is simply not probable."

By the "adversary," Origen, Ambrose, Ecumenius, and Theophylact understand the devil; others understand by adversary, the flesh; Hilary, Anselm, and Jerome, another man.

"It is," says the cardinal, "the truest exposition, that the adversary is the law of God. Thus think Anselm, Ambrose, Bede, Augustine, Gregory, Bernard."

But I must stop. So far from any of these texts proving Purgatory, the doctors and fathers are

not all agreed what is the meaning of the words, or, in fact, whether they have any meaning at all. And along with this let it be borne in mind, that every time you hear Mr. French give an interpretation of one of these texts, you see him leaving Roman Catholic ground—violating his solemn pledge in Pope Pius IV.'s Creed, and, *pro tanto et pro tempore*, ceasing to be a Romanist.

The bitterest enemy of Roman Catholicism need go no further for its exterminating proofs than to the pages of Bellarmine. I thank God from my heart that Christianity is not Roman Catholicism;—that infidelity may and must break up the latter; that the former is inviolable.

You again observe, there are three or four fathers holding one opinion, and three or four opposed to it; and my friend advocates opinions strongly opposed to *both* parties, and some opinions almost unknown to any of them. For the fact is (and the Church of Rome knows that it is so), that the fathers, with all their imperfections, *cast her off* in a majority of points. So long as the fathers unconsciously pander to her taste and propagate her doctrines, so long she glories in them; but the moment the fathers can be brought to bear against her, as they can, again and again, they are most unceremoniously kicked aside, and mention made of them no more. My opponent has been signally unhappy in referring to these passages for Purgatory, as they have referred me to the errors of fathers; and yet I know not what else he could have done: the fault is in the cause, not in the defender. We find father against father; the pope against the fathers, and the fathers against the pope; and, lastly, the Church itself taking shelter under its own boasted infallibility; casting over-

board the whole "infrangible phalanx of the fathers," St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Origen, St. Anselm, Ecumenius, Theodoret, Augustine, and a host of others, just because they dare to utter sentiments against her "primitive dogmas," as my learned friend is fond of calling them.

The fact is, the dogma of Purgatory does not seem to be sanctioned by the wildest of the fathers, so far as the present evidence is concerned, which is sufficiently strong, and certainly (as I shall prove to you) it has not one iota of sanction in the Word of God.

Now, in concluding these remarks, I must call your attention to the claims of the Apocrypha, as my opponent quoted from the Maccabees. When I have sent apocryphal books along with the testimony of the fathers to the grave of all the Capulets, my opponent's defence of Purgatory will be done for.

The books called the Apocrypha (as I showed you last night) were never written in Hebrew; were never quoted by our Lord; were never recognised by the Jews; and are not contained in the catalogue of Josephus the historian. These books of the Apocrypha are not in the catalogue given by ORIGEN, in the year 200. This catalogue is here on the table. In the next place, ST. ATHANASIUS rejects all of them except the Book of Baruch. Now here are two of the illustrious of the fathers rejecting them, and yet my friend declares, we have been plundered of part of the Bible. Again, I refer to the catalogue of the Canon by ST. EPIPHANIUS, A.D. 358, and I find *he does not receive one of them!* GREGORY OF NAZIANZEN *does not receive one of them!* AMPHILOCHIUS, A.D. 370, *does not receive one of them!* JEROME, A.D. 392, *does not receive one of them!*

Again, POPE GREGORY the Great, A.D. 590, (*Edit. Rom. 1608. Ex Typographia Vatican, vol. ii. p. 899*), rejects the Maccabees.

Gregory, I say, the great pope of the Roman Catholic Church—the most illustrious of the popes, rejects the Books of the Maccabees, which Pope Gregory XVI. holds in the nineteenth century!

Mr. FRENCH.—[To Mr. Cumming.]—Have you got the page of the Roman edition?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Yes! "*Romana Editio*. Printed from the types of the Vatican, 1608, pp. 899."

Now observe, I have given you a list of these distinguished fathers, whom my antagonist would lead you to believe are in *favour* of the Church of Rome. BUT WE FIND THE FATHERS, almost unanimously for once, REJECTING ALL THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS, with the exception of one solitary father, St. Athanasius (here mentioned), who receives the Book of Baruch. I find the pope of the seventh century rejecting the Books of Maccabees, whilst his infallible successor in the nineteenth receives them. I find a whole phalanx of fathers against the Church of Rome, and against her expositions of the doctrine of Purgatory. I find popes against fathers as fast as Greek against Greek. I find fathers against popes, and distinguished cardinals against fathers. Again, I find cardinals and popes against the Church, and the Church without any ceremony casting them all overboard. And lastly, here is a whole catalogue of these "glorious" fathers ("whom Mr. Cumming dreads, and Protestants dread," but which I do not, I assure you), holding to be *uncanonical* books those apocryphal legends which the Church of Rome now cleaves to, as forming part and parcel of the Bible. And

thus, my friends, we arrive at the *unanimity* of the fathers on Purgatory, and at the texts that prove it. The words of Pope Gregory are (as my opponent seems to doubt their existence—being, if true, fatal):—

De qua re non inordinate agemus *si ex libris licet non canonicis*, sed tamen ad edificationem plebis, editis testimonium proferamus. “Eleazar (1 *Maccab.* vi.) namque in picetis elephantem ferens stravit, sed,” &c.

I am really sorry that my time is expired, as I have scarcely as yet entered on that part of the subject which is most decisive of the anti-christian nature of Purgatory. I have neutralized and dissipated all my opponent’s proofs, and shown it *not proved*. In an hour I hope to show it *disproved*.

MR. FRENCH.—My learned and ingenious antagonist has begun as usual by deprecating all wandering from the strict laws of reasoning in conducting this interesting discussion, (a fault which he repeatedly, in servile imitation of my charges against him, attributes to me;) and promising on his part the most inviolable adherence to order and arrangement, in the course of what he is pleased to call the solidity of his argumentation. I, of course, in consequence of this his promise, have paid the most marked unre-mitted attention to him, in order to catch, if possible, something like the *sounds* of logic; but alas! I must say, that I have been once more most miserably deceived and disappointed; a frustration, gentlemen, to which, with the rest of my audience, I have been too long habituated, to permit it to have the least effect upon the serenity of my temper.

Well, gentlemen, sad as these frequent disappointments are, I do

not altogether despair of my learned friend; viewing again and again, as he cannot fail to do, the regularity with which I establish my premises, and the justness with which I draw my conclusions, he may possibly one of these days be stimulated to rivalry, and burst upon us with a flood of argument, in exchange for that in which he, at present, seems to pride himself, namely, the sallies of his wit, and the ease and volubility of his speech. But now to the subject.

The learned gentleman has asserted that I had misquoted on a former evening (though by-the-bye, the subject ought not to have been introduced, inasmuch as I could not now have expected it, and come armed with books to encounter him); but, he has asserted, I say, that I misquoted certain Hebrew words, or, that I gave a vitiated translation of them, in order to make out the point of the patriarch *worshipping the footstool of the ark*.

Now, gentlemen, I candidly told him, and I told you also on that evening, that what I said on the subject was taken from Bellarmine, confessedly one of the best Hebraists that ever lived in modern times. I stated likewise that the translation, if it was an error, was to be found from the pen of Jerome and from the Septuagint. And the learned gentleman this night, in the most extraordinary manner, reproaches me with my ignorance of the Hebrew language.

Now, gentlemen, (for, after the unceremonious treatment I have experienced from my reverend opponent, I shall express myself with the utmost unreserve, and in the plainest manner,) although I do not profess to be deeply conversant in the Hebrew, as the learned gentleman does, yet I must take the liberty of turning the cultivation of

that language on his part to immediate profit, wanting as I do the benefit of lucid interpretation, with regard to a passage likely to throw some light on the question between us, which I request him to give me.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—What is the passage?

Mr. FRENCH.—[*In continuation.*]—But then let me impress upon you that I never boasted of being well read in Hebrew. I was asked, in a conversation with Mr. Parkinson, if I knew anything of it in this discussion. Is not that the case? [Turning to Mr. Parkinson, on the right of the Rev. Mr. Cumming.]

Rev. Mr. PARKINSON.—Yes; it is.

Mr. FRENCH.—[*Continued.*]—Therefore, I have nothing further to say upon that subject, but as the learned gentleman has the Hebrew Bible in his hands, it will be a satisfaction, as well as gratification to me, if he will give you the Hebrew, and turn to the first chapter of Jonah, and second verse.—[*Turning to Mr. Cumming.*]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Pray go on, sir.

Mr. FRENCH.—The words are, “Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me.”—[*Turning again to Mr. Cumming and pausing.*]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—What is it for?

Mr. FRENCH.—I want it for an illustration of the passage. The remainder of it is:—“But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord, and went down to Joppa, and he found a ship going to Tarshish; so he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord.”—[*Another pause, looking at Mr. Cumming.*]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Go on; I will read it when I rise to reply.

Mr. FRENCH.—Ah! but I want it now to illustrate my argument.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Oh, indeed! I don't wish to give you illustrations for your arguments!—[*Laughter.*] Pray go on.

Mr. FRENCH.—[*Reiterating his request.*]—I wish you to read from the Hebrew.

A VOICE.—He has not brought his Hebrew Bible with him.

Mr. CUMMING.—I have told you what I will do—I will read it when I rise to reply.

Mr. FRENCH.—If you did it now, it would at once put things to the test.

Mr. CUMMING.—Go on, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—If you would give me the Hebrew, I should endeavour to corroborate my explanation of the word “adore;” but as you refuse to do so, I shall not go on with this argument.

Mr. CUMMING.—Very well; I will reply to it. Go on.

Mr. FRENCH.—The learned gentleman is——

Mr. CUMMING.—Will you have the kindness to give me the Hebrew Bible? I don't read it so fluently as Greek or Latin, but I understand a little of it. [Here a messenger was despatched for a Hebrew Bible, who soon returned with one. A good deal of merriment was caused during this sharp contest of words, after which the learned gentleman directed attention to a different subject.]

Mr. FRENCH.—We have had a very brilliant specimen of the learned gentleman's logic this evening, endeavouring to show you, as he did most eruditely, the distinction between Purgatory and praying for the dead. Now, gentlemen, I would give the learned gentleman credit for a greater

proficiency in *logic* as well as in *words* than any man that has ever existed from Aristotle and Cicero down to the present time, if he could show me wherein the distinction consists between the doctrine of a third place (for that is all that our Church sanctions) and praying for the dead. Praying for the dead, the learned gentleman seems to think, is widely different from a third place. What, I would ask the learned gentleman, means prayers for the dead? Does he mean to tax the priests of the Church of England with folly when they pray according to the prescribed dogmas of his Church? If he prays for any one that is dead, does he pray for any one whom he thinks to be in heaven or hell? No, he will say. Then he must pray for him somewhere, for some relief or some respite from pain. He prays for their admission into the realms of heaven; or else he prays for nothing, he prays to no purpose whatever. This is what remains for the laws of logic to solve. Gentlemen, when the decree—[some confusion.] I really wish there was silence. When the decree came forth from the Court of Arches a few months ago, to the effect that prayers for the dead was an apostolic usage, it did not, as it appears, clash with the creed of the Church of England, but was in accordance with it; but at the same time they would not pronounce that there was a Purgatory. What was the consequence? Surely the millions and millions of Catholics all over the world, understanding something of the primary principles of religion, all cried out with one voice, What is the meaning of this, unless it substantiates the existence of a third place? At Oxford, Dr. Pusey, and all the learned Oxonians, cried out the Catholics were right; and that Protestants were wandering

from all the laws of logic in saying that praying for the dead is lawful, and in saying in one and the same breath there is no such place as Purgatory. And yet this is the reasoning of my learned friend, declaring that there is a *wide distinction*. Will he have the goodness, when he does rise, to spare a little of his precious time from declamation and invective for the purpose of illustrating this interesting subject? Will he condescend to point out the distinction, and lead us to know wherein it consists? In the mean time, I can only say that all he has hitherto uttered on that subject, to use his own expressive language, is *vox et præterea nihil*.

Now, gentlemen, I will give my learned antagonist a little of his favourite Calvin. Calvin, in the third book of his *Institutes*, intimates that the souls of the just are detained in Abraham's bosom till the day of judgment.

Will my learned friend now throw Calvin aside? But, moreover—

Mr. CUMMING.—This is my standard—the Bible.

Mr. FRENCH.—Well! I will quote from Collier's history—Collier, I say, who was confessedly a good orthodox upholder of the *standard Bible*:—

“Bishops Usher, Sheldon, and Blandford believed that the dead ought to be prayed for, and were wont, like the Catholic, to pray for them.”—*Collier's History*.

I call upon my learned antagonist to take particular notice of this circumstance, and tell me whether the three bishops, alluded to by Collier, are weeds which he will likewise throw over into our garden!

Melancthon confesses that the ancients prayed for the dead, and says that the Lutherans do not find

fault with it. — *Apolog. Confess. Augsburg.*

Dr. Thorndyke, *Just Weights, &c.* chap. xvi. says, "The practice in the Church in interceding for them (the faithful departed) at the celebration of the Eucharist is so general and so ancient, that it cannot be thought to have come in upon imposture, but that the same assertion will take hold of the common Christianity."

The Protestant translators of Dupin, page 3, confess, "It is evident from some very ancient records of the Church (nothing can be more so) that it was a custom among Christians, *ab antiquo*, to pray for the souls of the faithful departed in the dreadful mysteries." And a little after, they tell us that "St. John Chrysostom, in his third Homily on Philippians, plainly asserts that *it was decreed by the apostles*." "And this we find practised," they say, "by many eminent fathers of the Church." Again, the Protestant Doctor Forbes says: "Let not the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the universal Church of Christ, almost from the very time of the apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive Church, and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages." — *Discourse on Purgatory.*

"Nay," says Dr. Jeremy Taylor, "we find by the history of the Maccabees, that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead. This practice was at first, and universal, it being plain in Tertullian, Cyprian, and others." — *Liberty of Prophecy.*

Again, Bishop Montague, in his *Appeal*, chap. xviii., asserts a middle or third place, for he says

positively, "that the souls of the righteous before Christ's ascension, were not in heaven strictly taken; not in that heaven which is now the receptacle of the righteous." Then, in relation to the texts which seem to restrain the state of departed souls either to hell or heaven, he says:—"This is to be understood of the final state of souls after the day of judgment, when there will be no more than two conditions of souls everlastingly, viz. heaven and hell; and in this both Churches agree."

Bishop Andrews, in his *Private Devotions*, printed at Oxford, anno 1675, says, "Give to the living mercy and grace, and to the dead rest, and light perpetual."—Page 326.

Again, the famous, the really eloquent and learned Dr. Barrow, that bright ornament of English literature, and Dr. Thorndyke, a man likewise profoundly erudite, in the epitaphs they composed for themselves, request the prayers of the faithful; the one, that he may find mercy in the day of the Lord; the other, that he may have rest, and a happy resurrection. "Indeed," say the Protestant writers of the Encyclopædia, "the belief in Purgatory is now, by one of those strange revolutions to which the human mind is subject, becoming the general belief of Protestants."

What were the opinions of the fathers on Purgatory, may be collected from the following remarkable confession of Mr. Fulke, in his *Confutation of Popery*, page 362; where he says that "Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, and a great many more of the fathers, have erred in believing that sacrifice for the dead was an apostolic tradition."

Again, listen to Bishop Cousin upon the prayer:—"That we, with

all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss," says, "And whatsoever the effect and fruit of this prayer will be, though it be uncertain, yet hereby we show that charity which we owe to all those that are fellow-servants with us in Christ; and in this regard our prayers cannot be condemned, being neither impious, nor unfit for those who profess the Christian religion."

In King Edward's Liturgy I read the following:—

"LET US PRAY.

"O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that are dead, and to whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burthen of the flesh, be in joy and felicity: Grant unto this servant, that the sin which he hath committed in this world be not imputed to him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the regions of light," &c.

Lastly, leading eminent Protestant divines confess, that "all liturgies published, from the Council of Ephesus to the sixteenth century, Catholic, Nestorian, Eutychian, Malabar, Chaldean, Egyptian, Abyssinian, and Ethiopian; those of Constantinople, of the Greeks, Syrians, whether orthodox or Jacobite; those of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. James; that, in fine, of the *apostolic constitutions*, written before others in the third century, *all are uniform on the subject of praying for the dead!*"

Here you have King Edward's account—a Protestant king—sanctioning this as an usage of Christianity in those days. And therefore, my Protestant brethren—you who come seriously in search of truth, you who can discriminate between vehement declamation and weighty,

solid argument—you will see here that you have been deliberately defrauded by your instructors of one of the great doctrines of ages, as well as of a substantial part of the Bible.

So that among them you have been defrauded of praying for the dead; and yet, if we listen to my boldly-asseverating antagonist, there is nothing mutable in the Protestant religion!!!

My learned antagonist next makes some remarks upon the subject of genealogy. You will remember, I dare say, that he endeavoured to trace up our priesthood to the days of Cain, and I, therefore, took the same liberty with him, though rather more successfully. But with regard to Tertullian, it is with a very ill grace that he upbraids me with referring to the pages of a man who died a heretic, out of the bosom of the Church, according to St. Jerome.

He is as much considered and quoted by Protestants as a Protestant theologian, as he is by us as a Catholic theologian. I quote him only in his orthodox works. My reverend friend has quoted Tertullian against us, and I have quoted him against him; but where he differs from the orthodox faith, there we leave him. My friend then alluded to the sixth book of Virgil, as to Purgatory there. Why, the doctrine of Purgatory itself, as many of the divines of the Church of England can tell him, is not only a tenet of the Church, but a feeling of human nature. Virgil was well acquainted with the difference between virtue and vice, between a great crime and a little fault or peccadillo; and when, in his poetic and fanciful imagination, he wandered through the regions below, he thought it in accordance with nature and common sense to assign to its

inhabitants different degrees of beatitude or of torment. But I would ask my learned friend, since he wanders from Catholic and Protestant commentators to the classics—what is the use of squandering such a multiplicity of words, when Virgil himself, instead of overturning the case, rather substantiates the doctrine? Virgil may have read the Book of Maccabees. Will the learned gentleman contend that the Book of Maccabees, whether inspired or not, was not in existence in the days of Virgil? I have, myself, no doubt but that he alludes to the sacred books in one of his Georgics, where he says—

“*Primus Idumæas referam tibi Mantua palmas.*”

I have no doubt but his famous eclogue called Pollio was taken, as to its substance, from sacred books, and clearly predictive of the birth of our Saviour. The learned gentleman then goes to Aquinas and Delahogue. I tell the learned gentleman that Aquinas and Delahogue are strictly orthodox on all the tenets and articles of faith. How often am I to tell him that we reject those figurative passages to which he alludes, and which we interpret as we like, and in which we have the greatest latitude; but the moment that the interpretation of the fathers and the College of Maynooth differ—the moment Delahogue wanders from the faith of ages, and the learned works of antiquity, as to substantials, that moment he becomes a heretic, and alien to our Church; he may enter any modern Church, but he does not belong to us. Till then I cannot throw the ever-venerable Delahogue over into his garden. Again, as to Dupin; I have told him before (and it is useless to occupy any more time on the subject), I mentioned from the beginning, and I now repeat, that I

consider Dupin in his writings as a deadly enemy to the Catholic Church; because, when I admit he is heretical, it is really unfair and ungenerous to proceed in casting Dupin against us. But, my friends, when I come to these liturgies, there I am upon ground upon which I must dwell a little longer. Once more my friend endeavours, and I hope it is his last feeble attempt, to invalidate these noble and glorious liturgies. It is impossible for any man of learning to do it. No man in the present age, save and except himself, would dare to attempt it. As for the liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James, says Archbishop Wake—[Some talking on the platform disturbed the learned gentleman]. Silence, if you please, gentlemen, I cannot go on.

JOHN KENDAL, Esq. (Catholic chairman) rose to enforce the learned gentleman's request.

Mr. FRENCH.—[*In continuation.*] Now, then, I ask, did I ever assert that these liturgies (as we now have them) were written by these men just as they are? No; I confessed that additions were made to them; I pointed out the additions. I know they were made to them; and that is what Archbishops Wake and Bull ever have contended. But listen.

“As for the liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James,” says Archbishop Wake, “there is not, I suppose, *any learned man* who believes them written by those holy men, and set forth in the manner they are now published. They were, indeed, the ancient liturgies of the three, if not of the four patriarchal churches, viz. of the Roman (perhaps that of Antioch, too), the Alexandrian, and Jerusalem Churches, first founded, or at least governed, by St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James. However, since it can

hardly be doubted, but that these holy apostles and evangelists did give some directions for the administration of the blessed Eucharist in those Churches, it may reasonably be presumed that some of those orders are still remaining in those liturgies which have been brought down to us under their names; and that *those prayers wherein they all agree*, in sense, at least, if not in words, *were first prescribed in the same or like terms by those apostles and evangelists*. Nor would it be difficult to make a further proof of this conjecture from the writings of the ancient fathers, if it were needful in this place to insist upon it.” —*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 102. “I add to what has been already observed,” says Bishop Bull, “*the consent of all the Christian Churches in the world*, however distant from each other, in the holy Eucharist, or Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper: *which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient Liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order, and method*; which whoever attentively considers, must be convinced that this order of prayer *was delivered to the several Churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them*.”—*Sermons on Common Prayer*, vol. i. Sermon 13.

This canon was not written till about the beginning of the fifth age, when the danger of exposing all that was most sacred in the mysteries of religion to the derision and blasphemy of infidels, was not so great as it was in the first two or three centuries: but when the canon was generally committed to writing, it was found to be the same, in substance, in all Christian countries. This showed the unity of its origin, in the unity of that faith which was everywhere taught by the apostles, and which was the spirit

of the body and language of the *liturgies*.

Again, listen to your own Protestant historian of the Church of Christ, the late Rev. Joseph Milner. These are his words (page 415): “I close this digression, if it be one, with remarking, that *the continued use of these liturgies in the Churches of the West*, demonstrates the concurrent testimony of antiquity in favour of evangelical doctrine.”

Now this is all I contended for, and all I contend for now—that these liturgies all agree in sense at least, if not in words, and that they were first prescribed by those holy apostles and evangelists—that is all that I contend for; and, therefore, let not the learned gentleman spend one more idle word, or he will have to give a serious account at that great day for a most wanton profusion of them, in attempting to invalidate these liturgies. I have proved the position that in their substantial parts they all do agree. They give every sanction to the Invocation of Saints and Angels; to the Sacrament of the Eucharist; to the Sacrifice of the Mass—those noble monuments look down with contempt and scorn on any man who attempts to batter them with such illogical weapons as my friend has done this night. The learned gentleman, among other things, has upbraided me with contempt of Dean Milner and Mosheim. I do not condemn the historian Dean Milner, the historian of the Church; on the contrary, I admire him very much, with the exception of such of his views as those of calling the pope antichrist, and some others. I think him a man whom I might follow in many of his narrations; at least, I think him generally in favour of the Catholic Church.

With regard to these liturgies, you know, by the extract I have

above cited, what he says in corroboration of their *concurrent testimony*.

Shall I be told after this that I must give up these liturgies, because of the feeble attempt and the storm and indignation that has been raised against them this evening? When you retire home, examine the question by yourselves. It is worth examining, for a great point hangs upon it; and it is, whether you have been deceived by your instructors at the Reformation, or whether the Catholic Church is speaking the voice of truth at the present moment, when it tells you that the doctrine of Purgatory is indubitable. Another argument which I refuted before, and which scarcely requires another word, was, as to the Mother of God being found in the liturgies. That, however, is not a point on which I shall dwell. The passage was from St. James; and the fathers of the Council of Ephesus declared that they had the words "Mother of God" transmitted to them. Dr. Burton says, in his Tracts against Unitarians, that it was known before the Council of Nice. I am sorry, gentlemen, that I am not able really to come to more solid matter. I leave a number of these notes unanswered for want of time.

Now, doubtless, my learned friend, in his wide and sweeping endeavours, will throw Dr. Jeremy Taylor over? However, I wish to give something solid for my friend to answer, instead of imitating those excursions he is so fond of making in his wandering logic. Lazarus was dead four days; so we find in the New Testament. I want to have a distinct answer as to where his soul was, or whither it went to, if there was no third place?—whether to hell or heaven? Again, Paul and Onesiphorus. One can scarcely doubt that he was dead when he wrote that epistle. He salutes the family,

not Onesiphorus, as he was wont to do; on the other hand, he prays for him after praying for the family. The reason is, Onesiphorus being dead, could not be saluted, or he would have been saluted in the Epistle by St. Paul. But the apostle *prayed* for him. Had Onesiphorus not been dead, he would have asked for him, as he had done for his family, of the God of mercy. He says—"The Lord grant that he *may find mercy of the Lord* in that day: and in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus thou knowest very well." A term so appropriate, that it was adopted in the early Church for many centuries. Again (Matt. v.): "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." Do not I understand here that there is a place of punishment from which you shall not come out until the uttermost farthing be paid? What will the learned gentleman say it was?—a prison, a hell? No; it was a third place, and that is all I want to make out; and as to the fire, which the learned gentleman insisted on as a Catholic doctrine, it is not an article of our faith; we are not obliged to believe it. Again (2 Sam. xii. 13):—"And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, The Lord also hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not surely die." Now, then, we see that though the sin was removed, yet there was a punishment to be inflicted on him. My learned friend will say, "Yes, in this life." But suppose a man to have committed a sin like David, and died

immediately after escaping punishment in this life, is it not accordant with every notion of justice that he should have some punishment somewhere else?

Gentlemen, in conclusion, I beg leave to read an extract from two Protestant writers in great and high esteem in the Protestant world. What my friend will say to them this night I cannot think. I shall, however, read them.

[This is worthy of close attention.]

Listen to the words of Sir Edwin Sandys:—

“Oh, is it not time at length, in the language of an eloquent writer nearly three hundred years ago, (the span of the Church of England’s existence,) “to associate yourself to that church whereunto the custody of this heavenly supernatural truth hath been from heaven itself committed; to weigh discreetly which is the true church; and that being once found, to receive faithfully and obediently, without doubt or discussion, whatsoever it delivers?”

“Now, to discover this,” continues the same author, “let us reflect, that, except the Roman Church, and such others as are united to it, all other churches have had their end or decay long since, or their beginning but of late. This church was founded by the prince of the apostles, with a promise from Christ to him, ‘that the gates of hell should never prevail against it’—(Matthew xvi. 18;) and that he himself would be assistant to the consummation of the world. It has now continued sixteen hundred years, with an honourable and certain line of nearly two hundred-and-forty popes, successors of St. Peter; tyrants, traitors, pagans, and heretics, in vain raging, wresting, and undermining it. All the lawful and general Councils that ever were in

the world have, from time to time, approved and honoured it. God hath so miraculously blessed it from above, that many wise and learned doctors have enriched it with their writings; armies of saints with their holiness and virtues, armies of martyrs with their blood, and hosts of virgins with their purity, have sanctified and embellished it.

“Lastly, in all other opposite churches there are found inward dissensions and contrarieties, change of opinions, uncertainty of resolutions, rebelling against governors, confusion of orders; whereas, contrariwise, in this church there is the unity undivided, the resolutions unaltered, the most heavenly order, reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection: all with admirable harmony and undefective correspondence bending the same way, to the effecting of the same work: all which do promise no other than a continual increase and victory.

“Wherefore, let no man doubt to submit himself to this glorious spouse of Christ.

“This, then, being accorded to be the true Church of God, it follows, that she be reverently obeyed in all things, without further inquisition; she having the warrant, that he that hears her, hears Christ; and whosoever hears her not, hath no better place with God than a publican or pagan. And what folly were it to receive Scriptures upon the credit of her authority, and not to receive the interpretation of them upon her authority also and credit!

“And if God should not always protect his church from error, and yet peremptorily command men always to obey her, then had he made very slender provision for the salvation of mankind: which conceit concerning God (whose care of us, even in all things touching this

transitory life, is so plain and evident,) would render us very ungratefully impious.

"And hard were the case, and mean had his regard been of the vulgar people, (whose wants and difficulties in this life, and whose capacities will not suffice to sound the deep and hidden mysteries of divinity, and to search the truth of intricate controversies,) if there were not others whose authority they might safely follow, and rely upon. 'Blessed are they who believe and have not seen,' (John xx. 29;) the merit of whose religious humility and obedience exceeds perhaps in honour and acceptance before God, the subtle and profound knowledge of many others." Thus far Sir Edwin Sandys, a Protestant, in his *Europæ Speculum*.

Listen also to that renowned doctor of the Protestant Church, Dr. Jeremy Taylor; a man, who, if splendour of genius can atone for the enormous crime of omitting to embrace that truth which shone so vividly in his eyes, will not be destitute of a very large reward in the kingdom of heaven.

"These following considerations," says he, "may very easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety, to maintain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seizure of men's minds and understandings, before the *opposite professions* had a name. As, first, its doctrine having had a long continuance and possession of the church, which, therefore, cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it for so many ages. And it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrines should serve the several ends of divers ages.

"Secondly, its long prescription,

which is such an advantage that it cannot, with many arguments, be retrenched; as relying upon these grounds: to wit, that truth is more ancient than falsehood; and that *God would not, for so many ages, forsake his church and leave her in error.*

"Again, the beauty and splendour of that church, their solemn service, the stateliness and magnificence of their hierarchy, the name of *Catholic*, which they claim as their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christianity; the antiquity of their doctrine, the continual succession of their bishops, their immediate derivation from the apostles.

"Their title to succeed St. Peter, whose personal prerogatives were so great. The honourable expressions concerning this church from many eminent bishops of other inferior sees; which being old records, have obtained a credibility.

"The multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion. Apparent consent with elder ages in matters doctrinal. The advantage which is derived to them, by retaining the doctrine of the church of ancient times; the great consent of one part with another in that which they affirm to be *de fide*. The great differences which are commenced amongst their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying unto a very great licentiousness.

"Their happiness in being instrumental in converting divers nations. The advantage of monarchical government; and the benefit which they daily enjoy by it. The piety and the austerity of their religious orders of men and women. The single life of their priests and bishops. The riches of their church; the severity of their fasts, and other their exterior observances.

"The great reputation of their bishops for faith and sanctity. The

known holiness of some of these persons, whose institutes the religious persons do now imitate and follow.

"Their miracles. The casualties and accidents that have happened to many of their adversaries. The oblique acts and indirect proceedings of many of those who have departed from them.

"And, among many other things, the name of heretic and schismatic, which they fasten upon all that disagree with them," &c.

Such is the noble concession made to truth in a disinterested hour by Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man whose keen, penetrating discernment enabled him in a moment to pierce through the mists of surrounding error! And oh that words like his, glowing as they are with the spirit of truth, and calculated as they are to allure others to its sacred fountain, should have failed to produce the due effect in the mind of him that uttered them! How is this to be accounted for? is a question that can be solved only by the great Inspector of all hearts and actions. In the mean time, it cannot incur the imputation of being deficient in charity, if I observe, that had he possessed a sufficient contempt of earthly splendour to permit him wholly and exclusively to be enamoured of the celestial, beyond all doubt he would have lived and died exclaiming with a St. Augustine, "*Credo in unam Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam*:" "I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This, I say, is a noble concession made to truth in a disinterested hour by Dr. Jeremy Taylor—a man whose perspicacity and wisdom shone so luminously amid the stupor of surrounding error. Oh! such words as these are indeed worthy of the mind that uttered them!

GEORGE FINCH, Esq., here inquired, on behalf of Mr. Cumming, the reference to Jeremy Taylor.

MR. FRENCH.—I have taken it from one of his works, a large volume by Basil Montagu. I will furnish it next time. Now, gentlemen, my friends—my Protestant friends—as this is the last time which I shall have the opportunity of addressing you this evening, may I request your attention to these words of Jeremy Taylor? It may naturally appear to you a gross inconsistency that he, after having written that divinely-recorded passage, should have lived and died in the bosom of the Protestant Church. I can give you one satisfactory reason for it. There are few men who have a contempt for earthly lucre, disregarding the silver and the gold, and all chance of worldly prosperity. Scarcely had a month elapsed after writing that, when he was promoted to a bishopric of Ireland, and from that moment he drew forth his pen with the utmost virulence against the Catholic religion.

Certain it is, that the passage came from the pen of Jeremy Taylor, whether he gives it as conveying his own sentiment or not; and I think that the learned gentleman has sufficient acumen to recognise in it the masterly energy of his style. On that allegorical passage allusive to "stubble, hay, gold, and silver," the fathers have all differed, and modern interpreters differ. If any three gentlemen, Protestants or Catholics, were enclosed in closets, and had never read an interpretation of it, and were asked for an interpretation of it, they would all come to a different conclusion. But does that make out the case against us, supposing that the fathers do differ on figurative points? Whether they teach Purgatory, or the Invocation

of Saints, or the Mass, or the doctrine of the Eucharist, or the doctrine of the Rule of Faith; there it is that you see their beautiful and harmonious concurrence, and that is all that I maintain. But the learned gentleman not only wishes to prove that they are discordant, but he would wish me to throw Augustine and Delahogue and others, just as it suits him, overboard, as he says. If he can show where Delahogue is in opposition to the Catholic faith—if he can show where St. Austin's faith differed in fundamentals, I will tell my learned friend that the *Church would have thrown them overboard long ago*, and they would have come under their brand as heretics, such as Ærius and Vigilantius.

St. Austin made public prayers for the repose of the soul of Monica, his mother. He offered up his prayers to heaven for her. And what means his desire that she should be cleared from her sins, which she would have to answer for in another world? But as to the part in which he alludes to the stubble and the hay and precious stones, I know that he was not able to draw a satisfactory conclusion from it. I clearly see, however, that what the apostle means is Purgatory, when he says *some shall be saved yet so as by fire*. I cling to it, since it is corroborated by the voice of the tradition of ages; and there is not a Catholic country in Europe where this line is not quoted as decisive on the grand question. Now, will the learned gentleman tell me when *it began to be taught* in any catechism? Again, will he point out in every age when the Catholic youth of every country were found to be thus taught by their reverend apostolic priests, regularly ordained and consecrated priesthood, to repeat it as one of the strongest testimonies to the doc-

trine of Purgatory? "Some shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Again, can the learned gentleman tell me—can he prove to me by any solid logic, that it is not so; that it does not mean that? I know the learned gentleman will give a very authoritative interpretation of it, and "gathering up all the glorious inspiration of Protestantism," as he calls it, will throw my interpretation aside. But let the learned gentleman remember that I have the liberty of reading the Bible for myself, and in reading that passage, I deduce the doctrine of Purgatory.

Now, it is most indisputable, my friends, that the ancient fathers prayed for the souls of all the departed; and that the custom was kept up by our forefathers until the day when the Bible underwent a remodelling under your pious Protestant instructors, when they lopped off, by an absolute decree, so many books of the Bible—the books of Tobias and Maccabees, and others, without any authority, except that of arbitrary proceeding. By what species of argument will the learned gentleman rise this evening to prove that there is no such doctrine, and that it is not of apostolical ages?

The learned gentleman tells me that Pope Gregory asserted that the books of Maccabees were not canonical. *That* I call in question positively. And if he did (mark this!) it would not alter the thing; it would be a *lapsus memoriæ*. The Council of Carthage styled them canonical; the authority of the Church subsequently settled it; the Bible was undisputed till the Reformation. Now, as to the Book of Maccabees and the fathers, my friend quotes St. Cyprian doubting the book of Maccabees.

REV. J. CUMMING.—No, no, *rejecting* them.

MR. FRENCH.—If he rejected

them, what signifies that? St. Paul to the Hebrews would be rejected likewise: "*which epistle*," says St. Augustine, "*some ascribe to the apostle Paul, and some deny it.*"—(*Aug. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xvi.) It was only the Council of Carthage that settled it. The Council of Laodicea mentions nothing about the Book of Revelations. Is the Book of Revelations *therefore* false? It was at last settled, when every thing was definitively settled at Carthage in the fourth century, and enumerated as they are now. Now I want to know by what authority my learned friend can prove the propriety of altering these books, when the Council of Carthage had settled them, and when the whole world un-murmuringly received them among the canonical books for so many centuries? The cause of it was filthy lucre; this was the cause of expunging the Book of Maccabees. Cranmer and Seymour immediately confiscated all the altars and monasteries, and extinguished the doctrine of Purgatory, and the Books of Maccabees were blotted out of the Bible, and declared to be a vile thing. But then mark the perpetually-descending continuance of this thirst for lucre. At Oriel College they pray for the repose of the soul of its founder; and why? Because otherwise the college, with its appurtenances, the *summum bonum* of celestial Protestant felicity, would be forfeited, according to the condition of the original deed of grant.

It is a fact that cannot be denied, that year after year, in order to keep the filthy lucre, they do so at Oriel College, and it is done in other parts of England. At Oxford it is, and it cannot be denied by my learned friend. So much for his attack upon us on the ground of lucre; as if the Catholic priest, forsooth, thirsted after filthy lucre

with equal avidity and passion with the generality of the Protestant clergy!

[The learned gentleman's hour here expired.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I am sure, Mr. Chairman and Christian friends, that if ever there was presented a moral and intellectual spectacle calculated to evoke the sympathies of all who beheld it, that spectacle has been presented this evening by my earnest, but fatally misled opponent. He, perceiving that the word of God gives no footing to the doctrine of Purgatory; that even the most distinguished doctors of his own Church confess that in the interpretation of the very passages that are recorded as its sole pillars and its strong defences, the opinion of father is against father, doctor against doctor, and all against Pope Pius IV., and the present Pope against them all, when it suits the Pope's purpose to be so;—I say, finding that almost every father is against him—I say almost *every* father, for I have given you a list of those fathers who reject the Apocrypha as uncanonical books; and I have shown you that one of the *ci-devant* popes of his own Church, Gregory the Great, distinctly declares, concerning the Book of Maccabees, that they are not canonical, and therefore fitted to demonstrate neither Purgatory nor any other dogma—my opponent feeling in Purgatory himself, and not knowing what to say or do, closes his extraordinary farrago by attacking some odd practice that seems to prevail, according to his account, at Oriel College, on the one hand; and by referring to certain droll sentiments of Jeremy Taylor, on the other. Now, such *logic* as this will not most assuredly satisfy my mind. It is neither rhyme nor reason, and it

cannot satisfy the mind of any dispassionate hearer, that Purgatory is a doctrine of the word of God. As to the quotation from Sir Edwin Sandys, I believe that it is a gross, though not, I hope, intentional misquotation. I believe that Sir Edwin Sandys gives just a *contrary opinion*, and this my suspicion I shall be able I think to substantiate when I appear again in this room. I believe that Sir Edwin Sandys is propounding the Romanist's best opinion of his Church, and *not his own* sentiments and words. And as to the quotation he made from Jeremy Taylor, I question deeply whether it is actually extracted. Jeremy Taylor was a most determined enemy of the Church of Rome, and has written most triumphantly against it.

After this, my opponent started his old whim for a defence of Purgatory, on which he long dwelt, viz. prayers for the dead. Now I wish to impress on your minds what you must have seen—that prayers for the departed faithful, right or wrong, do not involve the doctrine of Purgatory. We believe, as Protestants, that the children of God, who die in Christ, have not their happiness complete until the resurrection of the body. We believe that they are made perfect in holiness, but we also believe that their happiness on the morn of the resurrection will be greatly augmented by the resumption of their resurrection bodies; and I can conceive that just as we pray, "Come, Lord Jesus," without intending to imply that the very *hour* of his second advent is not fixed, but believing, on the contrary, that the hour is finally and unalterably fixed, so we may pray for the resurrection. I say, I can conceive prayers offered for increase of happiness to departed believers, and that they may have their happiness

augmented, without the offerers of such prayers believing in Purgatory, or the departed being necessitated to undergo purifying and purgatorial fires. I can admit, without sheltering the admission under cover of Purgatory, that there is a state of happiness after death, capable of augmentation at the resurrection morn, when the soul and body are to unite in one eternal fellowship, and therefore previous to the full happiness of believers. So also I can admit the possibility of Christians praying for souls in a condition of perfect glory and holiness, but waiting for the resurrection of the body from the dust, to enjoy the full reward of their faith in Christ; and yet deny that it necessarily follows that the advocate of such a practice believes in the existence of a Purgatory, a penal and purifying fire, or torments in the world of spirits. So that any argument brought forward in favour of prayers for the departed faithful being offered up by any Christian, does not convey one jot or tittle of proof that he believed in a Purgatory, where fires are to burn out our iniquities in order to purify our souls, on the one hand, and to inflict punishment for venial sins which we have committed in the body on earth, on the other. My opponent quoted again (astonishing boldness!) the liturgies which I thought I had fairly, finally, and mortally dispatched by showing that these liturgies speak of things and events (one of them especially, ascribed to St. James), which took place only three hundred years after the death of the assumed writer, the Apostle. My opponent clings to very crazy craft indeed.

I may also mention, that one of these liturgies ascribed to Basil, contains a passage which is fatal, but which my opponent deems most

favourable to Purgatory :—“ Be mindful, O Lord, of thy saints ; vouchsafe to receive all thy saints which have pleased thee from the beginning ; our holy fathers, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all the souls of the just who have died in faith, but chiefly of the holy, glorious, and perpetual Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, of St. John the Baptist,” &c. Do the apostles pass through Purgatory, I ask ?—The Roman Catholic Church says no ; and yet this prayer of Basil, quoted in the liturgy ascribed to him, prays for the souls of the apostles ; and if it proves Purgatory, it proves they and Mary have entered it, and that Basil held that she and the apostles passed through Purgatory. He comes under the malediction of the Church of Rome if he does so, and presents another proof of her “ glorious unity.”

But the fact is, the doctrine of Purgatory receives no countenance from this document, nor from the worst legendary lore quoted by my opponent. The oldest and best parts of the Missal are against Purgatory. The Missal of the Roman Catholic Church is, as you are aware, composed of some prayers as ancient as the second century. It is, indeed, altogether an amusing piece of moral and spiritual mosaic. In many of the prayers—the more recent ones—the most monstrous ideas are introduced, tessellated with texts torn from Scripture, and cut or stretched to the Procrustes bed of superstition. For instance : in one of these prayers of the Missal, it is declared that the dead rest in Christ.—“ Be mindful of thy servants, N. and N. who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and *rest in the sleep of peace.*” But, according to the Church of Rome, they do not *rest* in Christ ; they go to Purgatory, and

are tormented by literal fire until they have “ paid the uttermost farthing.” So that the very extract from their own liturgies in the Missal of the Roman Catholic Church declares that departed believers rest in Christ ; and yet the Creed of Pius IV., the creed of his own Church, declares that they remain in Purgatory till they have paid the uttermost farthing. Here is a difference for my learned friend’s logic to reconcile ; the one is a direct refutation of the other, and it is what I must pronounce in my humble way to be a totally irreconcilable contradiction.

My opponent next referred to the Jews for proof ; and he added, that Virgil must have borrowed his ideas of Purgatory from the Jews, or it seems likely, as he draws so beautiful and glowing descriptions, that his views are taken most probably from the prophecies of Isaiah. And he says, because the Jews admitted prayers for the dead, is it not a proof that Purgatory is true ? Now, if they had practised or commanded prayers for the dead, that would be no proof that it was right, or Purgatory true. Christ had censured them repeatedly for their doctrines. Are the Jews to prescribe the articles of our faith ? The Jews made void the word of God by their traditions. The Jews lapsed into scandalous idolatry, but is this to be precedence and authority for us to do the same also ? The Jews cried out in the most awful accents, “ Not this man, but Barabbas ;” and again, “ Crucify him ! crucify him !” The Jews were plunged in idolatry and corruption ; substituting the tradition of man for the word of God, and eclipsing the light of heaven by the gross superstitions of earth. And, therefore, if we may be warranted in receiving as truth all that

the Jews held, error becomes truth, and truth error.

His next remark was, that Milner asserts that these liturgies favour evangelical religion. I am glad my opponent believes that they support and favour evangelical religion. But observe, if he pin his faith so stoutly to these liturgies, why does he not take up their "evangelical religion?" Why does he not renounce the Roman Catholic religion, and cultivate that religion which Milner and he both assert to be as ancient as the liturgies?

The next quotation was on David's suffering the loss of his child after that his sins were forgiven, thus suffering for his sin after pardon. Now he took away the point from his statement and answered himself, by stating that he knew to what I would object—namely, that Purgatory is punishment *after* death, and that the treatment which David was doomed to receive was inflicted in this life. This simple distinction does away with the applicability of the quotation to Purgatory. But I maintain, that when David's child was smitten by the hand of God, it was not punishment. It was chastisement; there was no wrath in it. It was neither penal nor punitive. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons, for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?" (Heb. xii. 6, 7.) Such chastisement was intended to be a prevention of future sin, and to serve as a lesson to others, that when God forgives sin, its temporal and earthly effects survive, not as a punishment to the author of it, but as a warning to others.

The next quotation of my learned antagonist was from Matt. xii. 72, to which I shall refer. We find it

stated:—"Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Now, he says, this implies that *there is forgiveness in the world to come; ergo*, that it proves Purgatory. Now, mark the irrelevancy of this text—Purgatory is not a *place for forgiveness*; it is a *place for paying all the debt*. Now, if a man pay the debt to the uttermost farthing, he cannot surely want to be forgiven, since he gives *quid pro quo*, and is, therefore, entitled by every legitimate reason to escape. Moreover, when my friend asserts expressly that "neither in this world nor in the world to come," refers to Purgatory, I bid him look to the Gospel of Mark iii. 29, where we have the very same sentiment, and almost the same words, and unquestionably a parallel passage. Now we shall see that the text upon Matthew has no reference to Purgatory whatever. "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath NEVER forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." The word NEVER of one evangelist explains what the other evangelist means by "neither in this world nor in that which is to come." And, by thus comparing Scripture with Scripture, we find the penman's meaning fully and incontrovertibly explained, showing us that forgiveness is something done through the mercy that is in Christ in *this world* or *never*. Purgatory is debt, and doing, and paying, or remaining till the uttermost farthing be paid; but these texts refer to *forgiveness*. There is not, therefore, one shadow of a pretext for Purgatory in this passage. On the contrary, its sounds of forgiveness seem like angels' accents heard amid the other tones

of mercy, and to man's heart proclaiming that where there is full deliverance on earth there can be no need of Purgatory hereafter.

The next passage on which my learned friend commented was 1 Cor. iii. 12. Now I engage to shut his mouth on that subject altogether. I must merely remind my friend that he is under an obligation to his creed not to interpret holy Scripture otherwise than *according to the unanimous* consent of the fathers. I showed you, let it be remembered, that the fathers have the most heterogeneous, the most discordant, and the most extraordinary interpretations upon that very passage; that there was the pope against the fathers, and the fathers against the pope, and the fathers against each other, and Bellarmine against them all. My friend, in the midst of this babble and in the teeth of his creed, interprets the text. How dare you disobey your Church? Must you cease to be a Roman Catholic in order to answer for the faith that is in you? You had better have left these texts untouched, when you found the tremendous impossibility of the unanimity of the fathers. To be a consistent Roman Catholic, you must put no interpretation on the passage at all. The interpretation of my learned friend is, therefore, rash, and in no respect sanctioned by the Church of Rome. My learned opponent next asked me to demonstrate that the text from 1 Cor. iii. 12 does *not* refer to Purgatory. Now, little as he holds me to know of logic, I at least know thus much: that it is a monstrous absurdity to ask any one to prove a negative. But I will show you, to gratify my friend, that it cannot refer to Purgatory; for, observe, the statement here is, that "the fire shall *try* every man's work, of

what sort it is;" but Purgatory is not for *trying*—it is for *purifying*. But this fire is *to try* and put to the test every man's work; the words are to be taken in their fair and just sense. The verses also state that this fire is to try every man's *work*, but Purgatory is to purify every man's *soul*. And, therefore, whatever this passage refers to, it cannot by any possibility refer to Purgatory. Moreover, it says, "If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer *loss*: yet he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire;" but if this refer to Purgatory, it would imply that some souls in Purgatory may be lost for ever; whereas the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that every soul that goes into Purgatory, sooner or later comes out; that is, gets out in one way or another. It is "*every* man's work," but all do not enter Purgatory. And, you observe, as my antagonist insisted that the term "by fire" necessarily meant the purifying fires of Purgatory, I would show him that the apostle evidently uses a *figure*. It does not say, "shall be saved *by* fire," but shall be saved "*yet so as by fire*." And when you compare kindred passages of sacred writ you will find it so. If I go, for instance, to the prophet Zachariah, I there find Joshua represented as "a brand plucked out of the burning;" that is, "saved so as by fire." But you would never surely contend that Joshua was literally a brand, and actually in the pains of Purgatory!

Again, I refer to the Epistle of St. Jude:—"And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire," ver. 23. This took place on earth, and it implies plucking them out of

the dangers to which they were exposed.* And, moreover, it is known to my friend that this proverbial expression occurs in the ancient classics, denoting extreme hazard, extreme difficulty, or scarcely delivered, or scarcely saved.—(Vide *Cicero, pro Dom.* 43; *pro Milone* 5.)

The next passage brought forward was, 1 Peter iii. 19, where he says — “By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing.” He says these spirits that were in prison imply the spirits that were sent to Purgatory to be purified from sin.

MR. FRENCH.—To a *third* place, I said.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Well: *limbo*, or Purgatory; that is the third place. That is my point. There may be *new* notions started in the Church of Rome before Christmas, but the only *third* place *she* has at *present* is Purgatory. Now as to this passage — “By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.” How did he preach? By Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness. Christ preached in his own person while he was in the flesh; he preached mediately in the days of Noah, and by that patriarch, as he now preaches by the ministers of his Gospel in the Church. But I have just one quashing remark as to deducing Purgatory from this place: — *Those who died in the days of Noah, even by the admission of the Church of Rome, were guilty of MORTAL SINS*; that is, they rebelled against God, and did gross evil in his sight; but Purgatory is for VENIAL sins, not for MORTAL sins, and therefore the passage has nothing to do with Purgatory at all.

* Vide Isaiah xlii. 2. Joel ii. 3.

Augustine uses actually this very explanation which I have given of it. St. Augustine’s testimony is Protestant, not Papal.

Much has been said this evening upon the subject of venial sin, and of Purgatory being prepared for their rectification and cleansing. God forbid that I should announce the monstrous dogma, that all sins are equally heinous, or deny that there are some sins more heinous than other sins; but then I maintain, on the authority of God’s word, that “whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all.” I maintain that “cursed” (according to Gal. iii. 10) “is he that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them.” I contend (according to the language of Scripture in Rom. vi. 23,) that “the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” And again, Ezek. xviii. 20 — “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” I contend that all sin, such is its exceeding sinfulness in God’s sight, has death for its wages and desert, whether it be called venial or mortal. It was so with the sin of Adam. Satan called it venial, but Adam found it *mortal*. I repeat, “the wages of sin is death; whoever offends in one point is guilty of all.” “Cursed is he that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them.” While, however, I admit that one sin may be more heinous than another, yet I maintain that when the most heinous sin is once washed away in the Redeemer’s blood, and when his righteousness is imputed to us, our sins are entirely blotted out, and we need dread neither the fires of Purgatory nor the torments of that place where

“Hope has withering fled, and mercy sighed farewell.”

My dear Roman Catholic friends, there *is* a Purgatory provided—a glorious Purgatory. It is peace, not punishment. I glory in proclaiming it for sinners—its utterance is the Gospel indeed—it is the BLOOD OF CHRIST, THAT CLEANSSES FROM ALL SIN. Your sins may be mortal, or they may be venial; but, if God's word be true, all sin is death. But the Purgatory in 1 John i. 7, can destroy it. I can tell you, as I deem it to be my own noblest privilege to tell you, that there “is a fountain opened in the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness—the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin;”—*all* sin; whatever be its dye, its desert; whatever its distinction or its doom.

The theology of the Church of Rome, some observe, is, that Purgatory is, in the first place, PURIFYING, and, in the second place, that it is PENAL. We contend that it is neither the one nor the other. But before I refer you to passages I shall adduce from sacred writ to show you how unfounded and unwarranted it is, in order that you may have an idea of what Purgatory is, I will refer to the writings of a priest of high authority and sanction, O'Sullivan's *Compendium of the Catholic History of Ireland; cum facultate S. Inquisitionis et Regis*. It is signed and authorized by cardinals, archbishops, and bishops. Its date is 1621. Vol. i. lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 24. We find here a picture of the Purgatory of St. Patrick.

“There were numbers of men which no arithmetic can reckon up, all lying on the ground, pierced through the body. They uttered hoarse cries of agony, their tongues cleaving to their jaws. They were buffeted by violent tempests, and

shattered by repeated blows of devils.”

Now, mark, this is recorded, not of the damned, but is declared of them for whom the Son of God died.

“The devils drove them into another plain, horrible with exquisite tortures. Some, with iron chains about their necks and limbs, were suspended over the fires; others were burned with red-hot cinders. Not a few were transfixed with spits and roasted, melting metal being poured into them. Alas for those who do not penance in this world!”

Such is the prospect of every Roman Catholic in this room,—as every one has venial sins. Wretched superstition, thus to deceive you! They would make our heavenly Father a relentless despot, who, not satisfied with the shedding of that blood which cleanses from all sin—not satisfied with the Holy Spirit making us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, demands *that all*, though pardoned by the first, and purified by the second, shall yet go to this antechamber of hell, and there burn and agonize until every sin is avenged, every satisfaction given; even till “the uttermost farthing,” according to the explanation of my learned antagonist, has been paid.

I stated before, that there is no other Purgatory than the precious blood of our only Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; in other words, that through his perfect atonement *our* sinful souls are pardoned and entitled to glory. “If we confess our sins,” says the apostle, “God is *faithful* and *just* to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” Again, in Isa. i. 18:—“Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow;” (what can be purer!) “though red as

crimson they shall be as wool." What can be more complete? Again, the Psalmist, Ps. li. 7:—"Purge me with hyssop;"—they used to take the blood of an animal slain, and sprinkle it on the guilty sinner;—"Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be whiter than snow." We read, and repeat, and repeat again and again, "The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin." Through his eternal atonement, we can be made spotless as the virgin heavens, white as the driven snow, and pure as the finest wool. Can purgatorial fires make me more white, or more entitled to the happiness and fitter for the fellowship of heaven? Again, Isa. xlv. 22:—"I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins: return unto me, for I have redeemed thee." My dear Roman Catholic friends, when you are brought to trust by faith in the atonement of Christ, God blots out your sins like a cloud, like a thick cloud; there then remains nothing between you and the Holy One of Israel. The cloud that intercepted his beams, and defaced and overshadowed you, is scattered; and nothing else is therefore demanded to propitiate God or purify your souls, to entitle and fit you for happiness, immortality, and glory.

Again, Gospel of St. John, i. 29:—"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." This is not the language of the Church of Rome. She tells you in fact, if *not in words*, to behold Purgatory for taking away venial sins. But Christianity, my friends, not knowing such a device, and utterly disclaiming such a doctrine as Purgatory, gives utterance to her sacred and most merciful voice in her own beautiful and thrilling accents, and proclaims to you this extinguisher of Purgatory—"Behold the Lamb

of God that taketh away the sins" (venial and mortal) "of the world." And let me counsel you, "in all time of your wealth, in all time of your tribulation, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment," to look not to Purgatory, nor to saints, nor to angels; but look to this Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world, ever watching, ever willing to save. Again, I quote from Acts iv. 12:—"Neither is there *salvation in any other*, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." That name may be Purgatory, or it may be the Church, or it may be tradition, or it may be saints, or it may be angels; but the record of God, which cannot lie, and which, even by the admission of my learned antagonist, speaks infallible truth—the record of that word is in these Purgatory-explosive accents, that "there is salvation in none other name than Christ's." Again, we read in Heb. ix. 26:—"But now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself. If he does this, nothing auxiliary is required. Again, I quote 1 John ii. 2:—"And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." If Christ's blood expiates, Purgatory is useless. The brightness of the Father's glory, upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins—"made purgation for us," according to the Douay—sat down on the right hand of God. *That* is the only Purgatory, my friends; and after you have obtained by it purgation of your sin, none other need be feared, as none other is necessary. God does not punish twice, the substitute and the sinner too. If Christ have really purged away

our sins, what need can there be of another Purgatory? Your Purgatory is a work of supererogation, to say the least. Christ has purged away our sins in his own blood, and made an end of sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness. Rev. vii. 13:—"What are these which are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they?" Why, if they had been in Purgatory, and had come forth from the midst of the flame, punitive and purifying, the answer would have been, "Lo! these are they who have purified themselves in *purgatorial fire*; for whom millions of masses have been offered up on earth; for whom, after death, prayers have been incessantly made by the Church." But not a word of this. The question is asked, "Who are these? whence came they? and why arrayed in white robes?" The answer is, (and I implore my Roman Catholic friends to recollect the answer)—"These are they which came out of great *tribulation*, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," (they made them white in the *true* Purgatory, *the blood of the Lamb*), "THEREFORE are they before the throne of God." Behold, my friends, my Roman Catholic friends, and examine for yourselves which is the Church which seems to embody most of the love and mercy of God. Surely it is not that Church which tells you that, after Jesus our God has suffered that your sins may be forgiven, after his blood has been shed so amply that propitiation might be made, and that you might thereby be purged,—that after all this has been done, you have yet to go and be tormented in *purgatorial fire*. Surely rather it is that Church whose ministers tell you that *if you have washed your robes in the blood of Jesus, you*

have thereby made them so perfect, so pure, that the spotless eye of God, which sees flaws in the firmament, and imperfections in the angels, can see not a spot in you, but beholds you, as the word of God describes it, "without spot or blemish."

Again, I quote Rev. i. 5, 6:—"To him who loved us, and washed us in his own BLOOD, and made us kings and priests unto our God, to him be glory for ever and ever." And what does this mean? Does it imply that Purgatory is the place where our sins may be purged away, and in which all our guilt may be obliterated? On the contrary, it shows that the *only* Purgatory is in the blood of Christ. We are saved by Christ's *own* blood or sufferings, not by *our own* blood or sufferings in Purgatory.

In the next place, I must now show that the children of God when they die do not, according to sacred writ, go to a place of penal torment. I have shown you that we have A PURGATORY in the blood of Christ which alone purifies, and I have now to show you, in conclusion, that the souls of the children of God do not go to any penal settlement, such as Purgatory; but that all who die in Christ pass at once from grace to glory, from time into eternity, from earth, with all its sorrows, its vicissitudes, its tribulations, to heaven, with its unbroken and never-ending happiness. It is the record of God, that, "Whether you live, you live unto the Lord: whether you die, you die unto the Lord; that living and dying you are the Lord's."

To illustrate and prove this, I quote Isaiah lvii. 7: "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the *evil to come*." They are delivered

from all future evil, and therefore from Purgatory, and immediately pass into a state of felicity and rest. And to show you that in whatever state you die, in that state eternity shall keep you, I quote from Ecclesiastes xi. 3:—"If the tree fall to the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth there it shall lie." And the verdict of inspiration pronounced at the judgment-seat:—"He that is unjust, let him be unjust still." On the other hand, "he that is holy, let him be holy still; he that is righteous, let him be righteous still."

Again, I read John v. 24:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed *from death unto life*." But the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that you pass from death into *Purgatory*, and then from *Purgatory* into life eternal; but the statement of the word of God is, that you are passed from death unto life, and shall not come into condemnation.

Again, I quote 2 Cor. v. 1:—"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, **WE HAVE** a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." So soon as this mortal and corruptible tenement is shattered by the stroke of death, that moment the believer in Christ **HATH** a house, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. That tabernacle is thus described:—"In my father's house there are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you." Again, I quote the second verse of the same chapter:—"For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven:" "If so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked. For we that are in

this tabernacle do groan, being burthened; not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." If there be purgatorial fire immediately after death, the apostle could neither wish to be "clothed upon," nor use this language with ordinary propriety. No Roman Catholic can desire immediately to die. He must dread death as the introduction to torment, because he believes that, when he dies, instead of going to the bosom of his Father and his God, he goes to a place of torment; and that it depends partly upon the number of his venial sins, and partly on the number of masses offered up after his death, (which last depend on the number of guineas left behind, on a thousand contingencies precarious in every respect,) how long he may continue in the place of torment, and amid the devouring flames of a temporary hell. I feel deeply for my Roman Catholic auditors. I wish I could extricate them from their sad superstition, so full of fear, so destitute of peace.

Again, read Luke ii. 29, 30:—"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," (no dread of Purgatory!) "according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." Again, I read Luke xvi. 25, where Abraham speaks to the wicked rich man, and says, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now **HE IS COMFORTED**, and thou art tormented." Now, mark you, if Lazarus had passed into Purgatory, as Roman Catholics are presumed to do, who die in venial sins—and none are without venial sins—the record respecting Lazarus, thus depicted immediately after his death, would be, "now he is tormented in Purgatory," not the very opposite

declaration of Truth, "now he is comforted." The theology of your Church, my dear Roman Catholic friends, and the theology of the Gospel essentially differ; your priests dare not say of your dead infants and parents, "now they are '*comforted*.'" No; and I may give you the representation which my reverend brother (Mr. Parkinson) gave me of what took place in Ireland; there, while the Roman Catholics were surrounding the dead body with tears, and sorrow, and lamentation, and wailing for the soul in Purgatory, I understand that the priest in that country goes round, even at the funeral, and asks *something more* to deliver the soul out of Purgatory!!

MR. FRENCH, and several other voices (Catholics, we presume) mingling.—"No; no, no!"—[Great confusion.]

MR. CUMMING.—If this be the fact—[hisses again]—I am stating only what I have received from unquestionable authority—[Renewed turmoil].

A VOICE.—That is not argument!

REV. J. CUMMING.—My Roman Catholic Irish hearers know that it is the fact.—[Loud cries of "*No! no! it is not*;" after which, silence being restored, the reverend gentleman continued.] I do not think the fact extraordinary, for, according to your theology, the believer at death is not comforted, *but tormented* in Purgatory! Suppose you believe it not to be the fact,—and I do not wish to lay the least stress on it, and I disclaim the least desire to hurt the feelings of any Roman Catholic in this assembly;—yet, if the Church of Rome maintains that the souls of believers do pass into Purgatory, where they are tormented by fire, the fact is only to be expected; and, I ask, If the soul be in Purgatory, undergoing the pro-

cess of fiery purification, can it be said of that soul, "*it is comforted*?" Is it comfort to be found in St. Patrick's Purgatory, undergoing the pains of penal torture? Again, I read that when the martyr Stephen, in Acts vii. 5, 6, was about to be stoned, he said, "I see heaven opened, and the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Father;" and he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This martyr, at least, believed not in Purgatory, for he expected that, the moment he died, Christ Jesus whom he saw enthroned at the right hand of the Father, would instantly receive his spirit. Again, says the apostle, "To me to live is Christ, and TO DIE IS GAIN." This, the language of the apostle, is utterly destructive of Purgatory. "To me," says he, "to live is Christ, and to die is gain." He does not say, "To me to die is PURGATORY, but GREAT GAIN." If he suffered in this life, as he did, and had to pass through Purgatory in the next, then, *à fortiori*, his suffering here would be nothing to his suffering hereafter. Again, Phil. i. 23:—"For I am in a strait, betwixt two, having a desire to DEPART AND BE WITH CHRIST; which is far better." You observe, the apostle concludes that the moment he departs from the body, that moment he is "WITH CHRIST, which is far better." "With Christ," is essentially heaven. "Without Christ," which is far worse, would be the picture of Purgatory. I have one other passage wherewith to conclude the long train of evidence against Purgatory which glows in every page of sacred writ: it is in Luke xxiii. 43, where the penitent thief said to Christ, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Now, mark you, if ever there was a man that had been guilty of venial sin—if ever there was a guilty criminal

who had need of his sins being purged away, it was the thief upon the cross; and yet our Lord does not say to him, "To-day shalt thou enter into *Purgatory*, there to be tortured for a season;" he does not say, "To-day shalt thou be, as needed, tormented for thy sins, and purified from them, and having suffered the appointed consequences, be ultimately with me in heaven;" but our Lord at once announces the glorious prospect of every truly penitent and contrite heart, when he says upon the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

I ask, then, of every dispassionate auditor, Is there any room for Purgatory if we appeal to the word of God—to the distinct and express statements of the word of God? I assert that the whole of Scripture leads us to believe that after death we enter into one of two states, both of which are *final in kind*, if progressive in *degree*. Purgatory is an antiscriptural legend. We read, I assert, in the Bible of *only two places*, viz. *heaven*, as the receptacle of the holy—*hell*, as the receptacle of the sinful and the lost. We read of *only two ways*, namely, the *strait gate* that leads to heaven, and the *broad way* that leads to destruction and to hell. We read of *only two sorts of characters*, namely, *being in Christ*, by faith in his blood, and trust in his atonement and intercession alone, and being *out of Christ*, and aliens and strangers, without God, without Christ, without any well-founded hope in the world. If you wish for a title to man's forfeited, but Christ-regained heaven, what is that title? It is in Christ, and in Christ alone, by whom our sins are purged away, and through whom we have boldness to enter into the holiest of all. And it will be experienced by you, my dear Roman Catholic friends, if you

go to that blessed and only Purgatory, the blood of Jesus, that the record that shall be registered of you in heaven's everlasting tablets, shall be, "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." And if you wish peace or preparedness for heaven, we can tell you of One far more merciful and able, who can purify you as gold and silver are purified in the furnace, namely, the Holy Spirit. Christ gives you a *title* to heaven through his death, and the HOLY SPIRIT gives you *MEETNESS* for heaven by working within you "to will and to do of God's good pleasure." I implore you to weigh the statements of my learned antagonist on the one hand, and the *scriptural* truths, and arguments built upon these truths, which I have adduced, upon the other; all showing you that there is no Purgatory but Christ's blood—no place hereafter for believers but heaven, and no softer doom for the unforgiven guilty but hell. I trust that these considerations will show you that Protestantism and the Bible are the same, and evoke from every Roman Catholic heart toward the true Catholic Church the responsive address of one of old, "Where thou goest I will go, where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." If your faith is antiscriptural, you cannot be saved. I beseech you, flee from the wrath to come. Escape from Babylon to the Church of the living God; from Antichrist to Christ. It is not enough that we know these things in the *head*; we must feel them in the *heart*. Oh, my poor benighted Roman Catholic hearers, my soul yearns to reclaim you. If you die holding to Purgatory, and looking to it for purification after such evidence of its falsity, and without having felt on your consciences the

purging influence of Christ's blood, without having realized in your heart the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit, great will be your ruin, and great indeed will be your responsibility. It will be "more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah" in the day of judgment than for you. I implore you to lay these things to heart. I implore you, my dear Roman Catholic auditors, not to come here out of mere curiosity, or to cling to your creed even in its ruins, deceived by vapid, though proud pretensions and assumptions; for these solemn truths must be to you all either the "savour of life unto life, or of death unto death." It is the destinies of eternity that we discuss. I implore you to remember that religion is either *all*, or it is nothing. I implore you to study the word of God for yourselves. Read it when you lie down, and when you rise up, and pray to God to reveal its truths to you. My learned antagonist has said there is but one way to heaven, but it is not the Church of Rome, nor the Mass, nor Purgatory. It was proclaimed in Christ's own sweet and impressive words on the banks of Jordan and on the plains of Bethlehem. "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me." Do not imagine that, because you *conscientiously* believe you are right, that therefore you are right. St. Paul was most conscientious when he persecuted the Christians, but not therefore right. Nor believe that your priests will save you—they cannot save themselves.

Unless priest and church and conscience be enlightened by the truth, washed in the Redeemer's blood, and purified by the Redeemer's spirit, it is in vain to lean on these, or to say, "Lord! Lord!" for he will begin to say unto you, "I know ye not; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." I also trust, in conclusion, that you Protestants will take these truths home to your hearts, live on them, and pray for those ignorant of them; that you will, each and all of you, hear God in Christ, at the last great day, saying unto you, "Come to me, ye blessed of my Father, for I was hungry and ye fed me; naked, and ye clothed me; **INHERIT**" (mark that word!) "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

As the meeting was about to disperse, after conferring with his fellow-chairman a few minutes,

GEORGE FINCH, Esq. rose and said:—In consequence of Mr. Cumming having pressing engagements next week for the British Reformation Society, in Exeter Hall, it has been agreed that the Discussion shall be suspended till this day fortnight, when it will be resumed on the subject of the Rule of Faith.

The meeting then separated in its usual orderly manner.

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

EIGHTH EVENING, TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1839.

SUBJECT :

RULE OF FAITH.

THIS being the day appointed for the re-assembling of the meeting,

GEORGE FINCH, Esq., the Protestant chairman, rose and made the following preliminary remarks:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—As some time has elapsed since the meeting last assembled together, I hope the persons now assembled will recollect that there is to be no manifestation of applause or disapprobation on either side, and no interruption of any sort or kind.

Rev. J. CUMMING then rose, and opened his address as follows:—It is, my Christian hearers, with the greatest satisfaction, and in humble reliance on the aid of the Holy Spirit, that I rise to address you on one of the most important, as well as one of the most prominent questions, that are at issue between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches. I need not say that the subject I refer to is the RULE OF FAITH. But, before proceeding to expose upon the one hand the opinions and definitions of the Roman Catholic Church, and to lay open, upon the other, the opinions and sentiments of the Protestant Church, I feel it right and just to my learned opponent, to show you the tremendous danger of having recourse to any other standard of appeal than the oracles of God; among others, for this simple reason, that when I appeal to the Bible, the most illiterate of you all can refer to it. I am obliged to give you the chapter and the verse, and you can examine and ascertain whether I have quoted it correctly

or not; and if I have erred, either through the fallibility of nature, or through the perversity of my judgment, you can call me to account, and show that I have either wilfully perverted, or through frailty have misstated facts. But in the Roman Catholic Church, and wherever the tribunal is far off,—where the Bible is but one part of the Rule of Faith, and the traditions of men, and the interpretations of the Church are made to constitute the other part—I say that in such a case there is a field opened up, so vast in dimension, and so utterly beyond the cognizance of your judgments, that if a Roman Catholic priest, for instance, or a Roman Catholic layman, should state this or that to be the record, whether it be right or wrong, it is quite beyond your power to contradict him, or otherwise confute him. He has a mysterious capital on which he can draw to any extent. I will give you an illustration of this fact. You all remember, the last evening on which we were assembled, that my learned antagonist introduced a quotation respecting the Church of Rome from Sir Edwin Sandys. It was on the discussion of the question of Purgatory. You remember that he quoted from Sir Edwin Sandys, a Protestant, a startling description of the glories and value of the Roman Catholic Church; you and I (as well we might) were perfectly amazed at the extract. You heard him read a passage from so Protestant a writer as Sir Edwin Sandys, which seemed to show, *per se*, that Sir Edwin Sandys had really

given up all the claims of the Protestant Church, and held the Roman Catholic communion to be invested with all that is unrivalled in the hoary claims of antiquity—with all that is primitive and apostolical in worship, and just and scriptural in doctrine. In vain did I doubt it. Now, I ask what verdict this meeting will come to on the conduct of my learned antagonist, when I prove Sir Edwin gave the passage as Romanism's own most favourable view, in order to refute it, as he afterwards does. I accuse not Mr. French of wilful dishonesty; I cannot but think he is incapable of it. I accuse him not of wilful perversion; I cannot believe he would have recourse to such disingenuous warfare. I believe him to be a weak but willing and honest antagonist; but it will devolve on him to give this audience and myself a satisfactory explanation how he *dared* to say that Sir Edwin Sandys had professed what he never did profess. I say, that I trust Mr. French will give me an honest and open explanation of this fact, how Mr. French read all that *Sir Edwin Sandys records, when he puts forward the Church of Rome in her best and in her loftiest pretensions*, but omitted to say that Sir Edwin *at the same time adds*:—"THIS IS A VIEW OF THE CHURCH OF ROME TAKEN BY HERSELF!!" I fear this is a specimen of Roman Catholic infallibility. Either through the infirmity of mortality, or through misapprehension of judgment, or through some other reason, which I am unable to explicate, my antagonist has, most improperly, and most discreditably to the memory of Sir Edwin Sandys, given you an extract as his (Sir Edwin Sandys') opinion of the Church of Rome, which was not his opinion.

In page 33 of the work from

which my antagonist took his extract, Sir Edwin Sandys says, after giving the picture quoted by my opponent:—"This is the main course of their persuading at this day, whereby they seek to establish that former foundation, in the unfolding whereof I have been the larger, because trial had taught me that not by man's private election, but as it should seem by common order they have relinquished all other causes, and hold to this on the more effectual means to insinuate their desire."

Sir Edwin then proceeds to describe the Church of Rome; and, as my opponent has referred me to Sir Edwin Sandys for a correct view of the Roman Catholic Church, I take my opponent's advice with him as I did with Aquinas; and therefore listen to what my opponent has summoned me to read, as being, in my opponent's judgment, a just and accurate portrait. I am sure I am acting fairly in thus obeying my opponent. Sir Edwin says:

"What pomp, what rank comparable to that of their cardinals? what severity of life, to their hermits and capuchins? Who wealthier than their prelates? who poorer by vow and profession than their mendicants? At the one side of the street a cloister of virgins, on the other a sty of courtizans with public toleration. This day all in masks, with all looseness and foolery—tomorrow all in processions, whipping themselves till the blood follows; on one door an excommunication throwing to hell all transgressors—on another a jubilee, or full discharge from all transgressions. What prince so able to prefer his servants as the pope, and in so great a multitude? Who able to take deeper and readier revenge? Where less care or conscience of the commandments of God?"

"To conclude : never state, never government in the world so strangely compacted of infinite contrarieties, all tending to entertain the several humours of all men, and to work what kind of effects they shall desire—where rigour and remissness, cruelty and lenity, are so combined, that, with neglect of the Church, to stir ought were unpardonable ; whereas, with duty towards the Church, and by intercession for her allowance, with respective attendance on her pleasure, no law almost of God or nature is so sacred which one way or other they find not means to dispense with, or at least, permit the breach of with connivance."

Mind you, this writer was referred to by my opponent as a *favourable* expositor of the Church of Rome.

Sir Edwin Sandys next delineates the practical fruits of the Roman Catholic Church in Italy:—"The whole country is overflowed and overborne with wickedness, filthiness of speech and beastliness of actions ; base priests and friars each striving with the other in impudence therein, so that what elsewhere could not be tolerated is there in high honour ; what in other places a loose person would be ashamed to confess, these priests and friars refrain not openly to practise."—p. 9.

"It doth grieve me to think, yea, the thought of it must needs bring horror and detestation, what a multitude of atheists do brave it in all places ; there most where the papacy is most in its prime ; what irreverencers of God, villanizers of his saints, and scorners of his service."

Sir Edwin speaks of Spain in similar terms.

Is it not a curious and extraordinary fact that every writer my

opponent has referred me to makes out a case, not in favour of, as he claims, but in utter opposition to the Roman apostasy. In fact, apostles, evangelists, fathers, doctors, professors, knights, and squires—all seem, when read, to be instinct with the direst hatred of the papacy. Never was this plainer than in the present case.

My learned antagonist quoted Sir Edwin Sandys' statement, and made you fancy that this Protestant writer was in *favour* of the Church of Rome ; but, observe, I have quoted the rest of the passage, which, as you have always seen, shows that, so far from being in favour of the Church of Rome, I never could concoct words so expressive, or language so accumulative, to denote the abominations of any creed or system under heaven. Now, then, the inference I wish to adduce from this is, that, if my learned and honourable antagonist, "a barrister-at-law," accustomed to expiscate and analyze all sorts of evidence, is deceived when he quotes writers to confirm his own principles, then may not the ordinary priests of the Church of Rome, who are plain men, and some of them in this country not very learned men, be most seriously deceived when they set forth the doctrines of the Church by arguments from the Greek and Latin fathers and ancient writers ? Whatever they say, no Roman Catholic, however monstrous or false the things which they may state, can stand up and quote, as I have done, the rest of the sentence, or remainder of the page. Whereas, (to show you the simplicity of the Protestant Rule of Faith,) I refer you to chapter and verse in this book (the Bible,) and every Roman Catholic in this assembly can go home, and he can say, If it be so,

“Why, Mr. Cumming has misquoted the chapter and verse, or wilfully withheld the remainder of the chapter!” The Protestant rule puts every Roman Catholic in possession of the means whereby he can weigh, and examine, and investigate every statement that is made from it. The Roman Catholic rule is so complicated, and the Roman Catholic priests so fallible, that in their hands is lodged the power to deceive you; to load you with the elements of ruin, while you fancy you have the elements of your salvation. If your priest should happen to be a depraved man, (as I am sure neither of the reverend gentlemen by the side of my learned antagonist are,) then what awful results may ensue, history can inform you, and human imagination can suggest to you. So much, then, for Sir Edwin Sandys. My learned antagonist, let me repeat, is most unfortunate in his quotations. You recollect he brought from Aquinas a large extract, and in poetry, in favour of the Church of Rome; but when I had recourse to the seraphic doctor’s prose, he turned out to be stating and writing sentiments which he (Mr. French) would not countenance for a moment. He has now referred me to Sir Edwin Sandys; and when I go to Sir Edwin Sandys, and read the rest of the passage, it turns out that, so far from being enamoured of the Church of Rome, there never was a more decided and determined protester against its corruptions in the world.

Now for the question for this evening’s discussion. We Protestants say, that *whatever cannot be proved by the written word is not to be received as the inspiration of God*; in other words, that THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE, IS THE RULE OF FAITH. Now, I lay down

this position as that upon which I stand; our Rule of Faith is the Bible, and the Bible alone. I lay my Rule of Faith on the table [*placing the BIBLE on the platform table.*] I have shown you my Rule of Faith. It is before you. I will call on Mr. French to show *his*. I repeat it. This is a challenge. I require him to exhibit his Rule of Faith; to say what it is, and where it is.

I show you my Rule of Faith; I hold it in my hand, and now lay it on the table; and if Mr. French will now lay his Rule of Faith side by side with it, we shall then be able to contrast the two, and compare them—[*turning to Mr. French*]. I pause—I wait for my opponent’s Rule of Faith.—[*Here a long pause ensued. Mr. French showing no inclination to comply, the rev. gentleman continued as follows:*—] I confess, my Christian hearers, that, from long investigation of the sacred records, from perpetual and intimate acquaintance with their holy and beautiful contents, I can see in that sacred volume all that is needful for man throughout his pilgrimage below, all that can cheer and animate him in the prospect of that which is to come. I know not that aught else is necessary. I am fully satisfied with the sufficiency of my Rule of Faith, and find it to contain, in the language of a celebrated writer, “depths, indeed, where elephants may swim, shallows where lambs may wade.” I find it, it is true, to contain mysteries so profound and glories so effulgent that man’s imagination cannot rise to them, and yet I find that it contains truths so simple and prospects and promises so bright that the way-faring man may understand them; and we Protestants have been so accustomed to refer to the Sacred Oracles as our sole depository of

light, and life, and hope, and immortality, that you will no doubt be prepared to receive some extraordinary reasons why we should be dissatisfied with the Bible, and have recourse to some additional revelation, or tradition, or whatever they may be called, in order to complete and constitute the full Rule of Faith. What is there that is not embodied in the word of God? Do you wish to know the nature of man before he fell? I find he walked in the garden of Eden in sweet communion and fellowship with God as his father, his benefactor and his friend, the undefiled and the unfallen. Do you wish to know the character of man after he "brought death into the world, and all our woe," we read that the "imagination of the thoughts of his heart are evil continually." I read, furthermore, that the great Registrar of the Universe, looking down upon the children of men, recorded the startling, but expressive, assertion, "There is none righteous; no, not one." Do you wish to know what is the state of man, and what are the punishments to which he is liable in consequence of sin? I read in this same book that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." I read again, "The wages of sin is death." I read again, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the law to do them." Do you wish to know how man is to be restored and brought once more to communion with his God, which the fall had totally interrupted? I read in this sacred volume that the great God himself suffered the death and tortures of the cross, that this guilty world might be redeemed. I read that "the brightness of his Father's glory" became "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" that

"he bore our sins in his own body on the tree;" that he was "pierced and smitten for us," and that he is "made to us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and complete redemption." I read in this sacred volume that he is "the way" through which we rise from earth to heaven from the trammels of sin to immortality; that he is "the life" that quickens me; "the light" that illumines my footsteps; "the strength" that sustains me, "the Saviour" that receives me. I read in this sacred volume that I have not only a title, through his perfect and finished righteousness, to heaven, but also that he has prepared the elements of a glorious meetness for me, "having made us *meet* for the inheritance of the saints in light." I read that the Holy Spirit works within us, "to will and to do of his good pleasure;" that he sanctifies our nature, subdues our corruptions, and restores between God and man the sacred harmony which had been broken. This book shows me not only a title to heaven through Christ's death, but a fitness and preparedness for heaven through the mighty power of his Spirit dwelling in me. So that in looking into this volume I find all that man can want, for time as well as for eternity. Do you want life?—it is *here*. Do you want pardon?—it is *here*. Do you want sanctification?—it is *here*. Do you want a knowledge of yourself before the fall?—it is *here*. Do you want a knowledge of man after the fall?—it is *here*. Do you want to know how God can be "just, and yet the justifier" of the ungodly?—it is *here*. And every sacred rescript in all that is vital is so clear, that he who reads may run while he reads. So, you observe, all that relates to man for time and for eternity, I am prepared

to prove that the Bible furnishes, completely and satisfactorily, a light to his feet and a lamp unto his path.

Again, if we require the character of God, I find that he is described by his being *I AM THAT I AM*. If I wish to learn his power, he is here described to be omnipotent. If I wish to know his holiness, I read that angels and archangels prostrate themselves before him, and cry, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Hosts. If I wish to know his wisdom, the Scriptures say, "Oh the depth of the riches of his wisdom!" If I wish to know his goodness—"Thou, O God, art continually doing good." If I wish to know his truth—"His truth endureth for ever." If I wish to know his love—"He so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." So that, you observe, there is not one want in reference to the condition of man which is not embodied in the sacred volume. There is not one desire in reference to the character of God and eternity which is not embodied in the sacred volume; there is not one rule by which man's moral conduct is to be squared, which is not embodied in the sacred volume. And, therefore, my learned antagonist will have to show you the existence of a *necessity* for some additional rule, and give satisfactory reasons why we should not be satisfied with the sacred oracles alone.

I know that my learned antagonist, according to the policy of his communion, will call upon me to prove the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred Scriptures. He says we are indebted to Romanism for the sacred Scriptures, and that, if there had been no Roman Catholic Church, we should not have had

the sacred Scriptures. Now, never be deceived by such gross fallacy. No man in this audience is likely to be deceived by subtleties and scholastic sophisms. There were many other churches besides the Roman Catholic. There were the Waldenses; there were the Greek churches; the Armenian, the Syrian churches. There were many other churches besides the Roman Catholic Church, the most corrupted of all churches of the world. Suppose now that there is at Hammer-smith a water-company. Suppose I was anxious to have my bucket filled with water, and made application; but suppose the water-company came to me, and said, "Sir, you shall have no water from us; we refuse to give it you; or if you do take our water, you must wear our livery, use our buckets, and observe that there is no water in the universe save with us." What would be my reply at the moment? "Why, gentlemen," (I should naturally say) "there is the Grand Junction Company; there is the London Water-company; there is the Middlesex Water-company; there are five or six other water-companies; and I shall just take the liberty of dipping my bucket down into their streams, and fill it from them. So that I can turn away at once from you, if you keep to these terms, and yet shall be able to have abundance of water; I have only to go to the next water-company, and I shall find an ample supply." Now, just so is it with the Bible and the Roman Catholic Church. My antagonist comes forward, and he says, You shall have no living waters from *our* company, the Roman Catholic hierarchy—[laughter]; we debar you from that privilege; or, if you do take them, you must just give us the credit of being infallible and inerr-

able, &c. &c. I will concede no such magnificent assumptions; I will just go to some other ecclesiastical water-company cotemporary with you, and I will fill my heart with living streams from them; and you shall not have the credit of having given me one particle.

But, to return. He will call on me to prove the authenticity and genuineness of the Scriptures. Now there is just one simple fact I would state, as a specimen proof we can produce on this point:—first, *if the Bible be not inspired, good men would not have written it, because they would not have told a falsehood by claiming inspiration; for they would not have been guilty of claiming that which they had not.* In the second place, *bad men would not have written it, because they never would have enjoined the pure and comprehensive morality which the Bible contains.* Then what is the inference? *That God must have inspired it,* and that, therefore, the inspiration of the Bible, even from this, I would simply premise, must be satisfactory—[turning towards Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—Undoubtedly!

REV. J. CUMMING.—Mark this admission—for I am only laying the foundation of what must be a protracted discussion; and in order to show you the genuineness of the Scriptures, I will refer here to a very comprehensive and a very beautiful extract:—

“With respect to the uncorrupted preservation of the Old Testament, let us bear in mind the great care with which the Jews preserved it. How could the Old Testament have been adulterated previously to the Saviour? The Jews, who were divided into sects, the Talmudists and the Caraites, would naturally watch over their common Scripture with jealousy.

Could the Samaritans have been prevailed upon to unite with the Jews in corrupting the Pentateuch? The New Testament has been dispersed in different countries. The variety of sects which have existed watched it with such jealous care that none could have mutilated it.”

We have many ancient translations. Bentley, speaking of the various readings, says as follows:—“I, for my part, would not lament if out of the old MSS. yet untouched, ten thousand more were faithfully collected, some of which, without question, would render the text more beautiful, just, and exact, though of no consequence to the man of religion.

“With respect to the genuineness of the New Testament, contrast the several books; mark the coincidence between the history of the writers and their respective writings; observe the style of each. The Gospel of St. Luke is of purer Greek, Luke being a physician, and learned. We have Hebraisms in the New Testament, which show the writers were Jews.”

Again, I find an admirable summary in Hartwell Horne, as to the genuineness of Scripture. I shall not, however, read it now, but I shall refer to it on a subsequent occasion, after my learned antagonist shall have called on me to do so. And let me add, that I hope my learned antagonist will not call upon me to present a full demonstration of the authenticity and genuineness of Scripture, else I shall not only have to refer to ancient prophecy, and to its full and satisfactory fulfilment in the New Testament Scriptures, but I shall also have to refer to the book of Daniel; to the epistles of St. Paul, especially those to the Thessalonians and to Timothy, respecting the *great apostasy*; and I shall have also to

refer to the eighteenth of Revelations, to demonstrate that the predictions of the Roman Catholic apostasy are so plain and so impressive, that this alone would stamp the Bible to have "God for its author, truth without any mixture of error for its matter, and eternal happiness for its final and ultimate issue." I may also just add, that every Jew you meet in the streets is a standing testimony to the inspiration of Scripture. I may mention that the wandering Arabs, as they travel from wild to wild, and from desert to desert, are standing testimonies to the inspiration of Scripture; together with many other proofs that I shall be prepared to adduce, to show you that we Protestants are not all dependent on the Roman Catholic Church either for the Scriptures which we possess, or for proofs satisfactory enough of their genuineness and divine inspiration.

Now, I have already shown you what we hold to be the Rule of Faith, namely, THE BIBLE; and touched scarcely the *summa fastigia* of evidence. Let me next refer you to what *Roman Catholics* hold to be the Rule of Faith. For this purpose I shall quote from a work with which all Roman Catholics before me are familiar, and to which I am quite sure they will give their assent. It is from "The End of Religious Controversy," by Milner, seventh edition, A.D. 1827. He says, "The Catholic Rule of Faith is not merely the written word of God, but the whole word of God, both written and unwritten;" in other words, "Scripture and tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church."

Now observe this: my antagonist's Rule of Faith is the word of God, the *whole* word of God, *written* and *unwritten*. Now, will my antagonist be kind enough to

produce the word of God "*unwritten*?" I am not an Irishman, but you will allow me, for once, to perpetrate what they call an "Irish bull"—[laughter]—Will my antagonist—is he able to produce the *unwritten* word? Because, if he can show me one *single line*, which he can prove by irrefragable testimony to have been uttered by an apostle inspired by the Spirit of God, then I will receive it as a part of my Rule of Faith; but if he brings some extravagant statements, and vain and vaunting extracts, from that old stock in trade, *tradition*, then I really cannot listen to mere vague assertions. I must have something tangible; something that I can *look* at; something that I can test and try, and thenceforth appeal to as an evidence, and as a tribunal by which difficulties are to be determined and questions are to be deduced. I therefore repeat that, having laid down *my* Rule of Faith, I must insist on my antagonist laying down *his* Rule of Faith upon the table; and let this audience watch and wait the moment that my learned antagonist produces it. [*Turning to Mr. French, but Mr. French did not comply.*] Now I have given you a description of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Rules of Faith. Now, mark the transition. The moment we pass from the Protestant Rule of Faith, "the BIBLE, and the BIBLE ALONE," and go to the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith,—namely, "the written word," which is the Bible, and "the unwritten word," which is I know not what, and both expounded and interpreted by the Church—that moment we are in the regions of uncertainty, and doubts, and perplexities. Tradition presupposes a few things that exist not. *Tradition*—look at it in whatever light you will—tradition implies (in order to be perfect) that

men, its channels, must have *perfect memories*. It implies that they must have the highest moral *faculties*; perfectly pure and perfectly pious, with no tendency to evil, with no strong tinge of corruption. It implies, also, that they must have *judgments* extraordinarily strong; that they must have *faithfulness* so unwavering and so firm, that they are prepared, at all hazards, even at the risk of condemning their own conduct, to hand down this traditionary lore "from sire to son," and from generation to generation, through the eighteen centuries of the world that have now transpired, pure and unpolluted. So that, you observe, while our Rule of Faith is "*written*," and tangible, and fixed, the Rule of Faith of my antagonist is dependent upon treacherous memories; upon wavering judgments; upon damaged consciences and morals; upon the corruption or incorruptibility of the age; upon ten thousand other incidental circumstances which have so modified and mutilated the traditions and legends of the world, that the term "tradition" has become synonymous with falsehood, and "legends" to be a name for the romantic productions of human fancy.

Again, observe in the second place, that *we do not find in the word of God any order of men set apart for the specific end of conveying traditions from father to son, or from one generation to another*. I say we do not find any set apart for this specific purpose. In the third place, we find those who claim to be thus set apart, the bishops and priests of the Church of Rome, have been "so steeped in corruption," (according to the testimony of one of their own historians, who declares that "the Church of Rome was more *apostatical* than holy and apostolical,) that pure waters cannot have come through such filthy channels. Now,

if the "traditions" have also come through such a mass of corruption; through perverted judgments and fallacious memories; through individuals who were "steeped in crime;" whose interest it *was* to bend all maxims to their morals; is it not somewhat doubtful that such tradition has come down *pure*? If water flows through tainted and corrupted channels, is it not highly probable that it will contract some corruption through every channel it passes? And if "tradition," on which the Church of Rome prides itself, has come through bishops, and priests, and popes, corrupted to the *heart's core*, is it not probable, *nay*, is it not morally certain, that these *traditions* are, more or less, polluted from the nature of the channels they flow through? But perhaps you say, This is mere assertion of yours, that the Church of Rome was corrupted. To show you that it is not any of mine, I will refer to the Roman Catholic Church of some centuries ago, and quote Baronius, a cardinal of the Romish Church. Now, mark, I do not take a Protestant's authority; it is from the Ecclesiastical Annals of Baronius.

Mr. FRENCH.—Oh! the edition and page, if you please. That is very particular.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I do not think I have copied it—[*the reader must understand, the rev. gentleman read the extract from a manuscript paper*].—Oh, yes! I have.

Mr. FRENCH.—Give it, if you please.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—"Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici, Antverpiæ, 1603," p. 7, An. iv.

Now, this is a Roman Catholic's statement about the Roman Catholic Church. Mark you, do not suppose it is a Protestant one. I am going to show the sort of

channel through which these traditions came.

"Behold, the nine hundredth year of the Redeemer begins, which, by reason of its asperity and barrenness of good, has been wont to be called the *iron age*, and, by the deformity of its exuberant evil, the *leaden age*; and, by its poverty of writers, the *dark age*. Standing upon the threshold of which we have thought it expedient, before we proceed further, on account of the crimes which it has been our lot to behold before the door, to make some preface by way of admonition to the reader, lest the weak-minded should take offence if he sometimes perceives the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION standing in the temple. What unworthy, vile, unsightly, yea, what execrable and hateful things the sacred and apostolic see has been compelled to suffer! To our shame and grief be it spoken, HOW MANY MONSTERS, horrible to behold, were intruded by them into that seat which is revered by angels! With what filth was it her fate to be besprinkled which was without spot or wrinkle; with what stench to be infected; with what impurities to be defiled!" &c. &c.

This is not my language. This is the language of a cardinal of the Church of Rome; the language of a distinguished Roman Catholic historian, who asserts that "MONSTERS HORRIBLE TO BEHOLD were made popes into the apostolical seat." There were popes [to Mr. French, who was seen to smile, we suppose ironically]—monsters horrible to behold.

Now, if the cardinal and popes, those conduit-pipes of tradition, were thus filthy and abominable—leaky in morals and loose in judgment, how can they have handed down pure tradition? Is it not absolutely certain that, as there were no counter-evidence, these

monsters would invent lies to palliate their crimes, and hand them down as sacred traditions?

I have not given John Knox's description of the Church of Rome. This is not a Protestant's description of the Church of Rome; it is a Roman Catholic's description of the Church of Rome. Then we read, again, in the Annals of the same Cardinal Baronius, of the year 912, what were then the vices of the Roman Catholic Church. "How foul was it when sordid and abandoned women ruled at Rome, and, what is horrid to hear, and unutterable, false pontiffs, their lovers, were intruded into the chair of St. Peter! Who can affirm that men illegally intruded by wicked women of this sort were Roman pontiffs? All the canons were closed in silence; decrees of pontiffs were suppressed; ancient traditions proscribed, and the usages of former days wholly extinct."

And yet such men occupied the chair of St. Peter, and were infallible. My antagonist represents his Church as pure and infallible—the succession unbroken from age to age; and yet "there were false pontiffs." A Roman Catholic historian and cardinal declares that St. Peter's chair "held the greatest monsters of the age:" and is it to be presumed that tradition came like a pure and limpid stream through the hearts of men tainted to the core with practices from which human nature shrinks and recoils in horror? Baronius adds:—"Lust claimed everything to itself. Christ evidently was in a deep sleep in the ship, and the ship itself covered with waves." Can we expect sweet waters from such bitter fountains? How delightful that the word of God was preserved far off from the contact of such monster-popes! Notwithstanding, this Church boasts

that she is the perpetually "visible" Church! This is the Church which has continued from the first century to the present with all its *unity*, its *SANCTITY*, its *CATHOLICITY*; here it is well described by Cardinal Baronius, in terms which neither Calvin nor John Knox would have used.

I would not have dared to stigmatize her thus, lest I should incur the anathema of my opponent, or the exterminating censure of the present pope: one of the papacy's own sons has sketched Mother Church for us. Then I have some extracts, too, illustrative of the eleventh and of the twelfth century. However, I shall reserve them for another occasion; and rest assured that what you have heard is but a *specimen* of what the Church of Rome was in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries.

Now, instead of quoting any more of these, I will simply remind every Roman Catholic of this important point, and I wish to rivet it in the mind of every auditor before me. You, Roman Catholics, are accustomed to anathematize *private judgment*. You are accustomed to say it is the mother of all absurdities; a position which my friend will lay down this evening. He will tell you much in prose and rhyme about Jumpers, and Quakers, and Southcotonians, and many other sects scattered throughout the world; and, taking these as the basis of his argument, he will anathematize private judgment. He will tell you that it is a perilous thing having anything to do with it. But how will you be surprised, my Roman Catholic friends, when I tell you that the *whole substance and superstructure of your Church depends on it!* Your very belief in Romanism is a result of this same private judgment, and it forms a leading feature in what you call your Rule

of Faith. First of all, you observe, before you have got the Rule of Faith which Milner lays down—namely, *Scripture, and tradition interpreted by the Church—what have you to prove?* You have first of all to *prove the inspiration of Scripture*. You have to do that, mind you. It is of no use to say that you prove a Church by Scripture, and then Scripture by it. That is not the way; that is "reasoning in a circle." But you have first of all to prove *the inspiration of Scripture*; next, to prove the *truth of Christianity*. You are, in the third place, to prove by private judgment from Scripture, that *there is to be a church to the end of time*; and you have, in the fourth place, to prove what are to be the *characteristics of this same church, as these are described in the word of God*. In the next place, you are to prove that this church is to be *inerrable and infallible*; and then, lastly, (the most difficult of all,) that the Church of Rome is *that* Church. Now, observe, before you can lay hold of your Rule of Faith, viz. the "written and the unwritten word," interpreted by the Church, you have first to prove the inspiration of Scripture; you have next to prove the truth of Christianity; you have next to prove that there is to be a Church to the end of time; in the next place to prove that this Church is inerrable and infallible; and in the last place to prove that this Church is the Church of Rome. Now these points every Roman Catholic has to *prove* by private judgment before he gets at his Rule of Faith; so that the fact is, he first gets at his Rule of Faith when he does not want it, and he loses it at the very moment when he ought to have it.

For instance, in order to show that the Church of Rome is *THE* Church of Christ, (mind, I am only

alluding to the last point) my antagonist will have to show that the Church of Rome has *unity*. Now, I will show you something upon that point too. Secondly, that it has *sanctity*, and that, of course, with Baronius and the *monster*-popes and women-popes fully before him; in the next place, her *apostolicity* during eighteen centuries; and he will have to show that Purgatory is right, that the Mass is right, that Transubstantiation is right. So that, if I have shaken one single doctrine of the whole system already, the whole of the Church of Rome falls to the ground, and is a mass of ruins, and nothing more. Observe, then, if you prove private judgment is such a precursor and progenitor of heresy, as we are so apt to hear it described to be; then, observe, you Roman Catholics cut your own throats; you are just as much dependent on this same private judgment in interpreting God's word as we are; for private judgment it is, this so-much-scouted private judgment, which leads you to the conclusion of the infallibility of the Church, which is the great foundation of your system.

Surely you will allow that, if you can prove an infallible church by private judgment, we Protestants may, in the exercise of private judgment enlightened by the Spirit of God applied to Scripture, find out that Christ is God; that there is salvation through his name; that there is forgiveness through his blood; sanctification through his Spirit; that there is a moral law by which we are to be ruled? If you can reach to the most important things by the exercise of private judgment, you will surely allow, *à fortiori*, that we Protestants, steeped in ignorance and unhonoured by the infallibility of the Church as we are, may discover, notwithstanding,

those truths which you hold to be of less value.

Now I wish Roman Catholics to bear this in mind, and not to be dazzled with mere foolish show of learning; not to let their judgments be darkened by pompous and ostentatious harangues about the infallibility of the Church; for you must remember that you *only* find that Church by the exercise of private judgment on the Bible. You only find it to be "infallible" by the same exercise; and lastly, you find out the Church of Rome to be the true Church by the same process by which I hold it to be a corrupt portion of the Church of Christ, as you shall be able to judge.

Dr. Milner lays down a few marks of the true Church, and quietly takes it for granted that nobody will doubt that the Roman Catholic Church possesses them. He sets out on the position that Rome is the true Church. There is the hitch. It is very well to try to make the Roman Church pass for it, and to presume most candidly that the Church of Rome is the true church. We Protestants question it; and therefore, my Roman Catholic friends, we would have you to ascertain, by the exercise of this same exploded and despised private judgment, which is the true church. It is not enough to take it as granted. Prove it. After all, therefore, if we are to be charged with all the monstrosities of sect, and system, and persuasion, because we bring private judgment to bear upon the Oracles of God, remember, that if *our* foundation is of "sand," according to your estimation, *yours* is not *one whit* the better.

There is yet another point. Suppose I want to know "what is truth?" now what system shall I pursue? How is the inquirer to get it? Not surely by merely going

to the Church of Rome is he to find the attainment of truth and salvation; because an individual may go to chapel "and hear mass" every Sunday, and yet know nothing, understand nothing, and positively believe nothing. If the Roman Catholic priest says to me, "Why, hear the Church!" I answer, "Well, I want to hear the Church. It is not surely by the steeple, and by listening to the tinkling of the mass-bell, by the odours of incense, and other puerile solemnities, that I do so; that is not hearing the Church." Well, what then? I go to the priest, and he tells me he is "a fallible man," and I show you that this is perfectly true, and that you will frequently find one priest arrayed against another priest. Well! when he has made that admission, I ask him, "Where shall I go? You told me to 'hear the Church:' I go to you as its nearest representative, but you do not instruct me which is 'the way, the truth, and the life.'" I go to the priest, and he tells me, "I am not infallible:" well, then, where am I to go? He says still, "Hear the Church." Well, I think, "Perhaps the Church has given some infallible commentary on the word of God; if so, you will be pleased to produce it," I naturally say. But the fact is this: the same Church which claims to be infallible has never done an infallible deed. She has not a written infallible commentary on the word of God—not one. Must she not be a most cruel mother, if she possess "that golden key that opens the palace of eternity and the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," and yet, by leaving it unused, allow her victims to grope on in "darkness that may be felt?"

Again, he says, "You are to hear General Councils." Now councils are against popes, and popes pitched

against councils; and again, councils are against councils, and *vice versa*; and we do not know whom we are to hear, because they are all one mass of contradiction and contrariety. I go to one party in Italy, and they say, "The pope is infallible." I go to Mr. French, and he says, "He is only infallible at the head of a General Council." I go to a third, and *they* say, "The *whole church* is infallible." So that this wonderful attribute of infallibility, like an airy ghost, jumps from your fingers the very moment the word of God is held up to turn it to a profitable account. So that, observe, instead of having a clear and definitive system which would lead an individual to come to a satisfactory solution of his difficulties, I find that all is uncertainty; all is difficulty; all is corruption, during whole epochs and centuries of the Church; and last of all she drives me further off than ever from the reach of infallible rectitude and truth, of which the Church of Rome claims to be in the exclusive and privileged possession. And, moreover, the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, which every priest subscribes to, which Mr. French, my learned antagonist, subscribes to, both *it* and *he* say, that "you are not to interpret Scripture, *unless* according to the *unanimous* consent of the fathers." I showed you long ago that these fathers contradict themselves; that one father contradicts another; and night after night I knocked the fathers' heads against each other, showing, that so far from being *unanimous*, they were the most discordant conclave that ever was presented to intelligent and soberminded men. But never forget, that MR. FRENCH DARE NOT PUT ONE INTERPRETATION ON ONE TEXT OF GOD'S WORD, TILL HE HAS FOUND THE FATHERS TO BE UNANI-

MOUS. If he do, he abandons his own ground. Now, I defy him to find them unanimous; they are contradictory throughout; and therefore, if he is an honest, conscientious, and devoted Roman Catholic, he must shut his mouth, and give no interpretation upon one single text till he has found that undiscoverable thing, “the *unanimity!* of the fathers.” I will not now go into any new additional matter, as I find that I have only half-a-minute to spare. Let me, therefore, just add, in conclusion, that I will now, in the first place, call on my learned antagonist to bring forward *his* Rule of Faith, as I before stated, and deposit it on this table before this audience beside mine. I will next call upon him to show plainly and satisfactorily, that his “traditions” have descended to us pure, uncontaminated, uncorrupted, through the multiplicity of “abominable and monster-channels” (to use the language of a cardinal of his own church) through which they have passed. I will next call on him to show how, if private judgment is so treacherous, so precarious, it comes to pass, that the Church of Rome believes fundamental and essential truth in this same exercise, and on the presumption of the value and importance of private judgment, which she all along, in words, professes to despise?

[Here the reverend gentleman’s hour terminated.]

MR. FRENCH.—Instead, my friends, of obeying the different calls of my learned antagonist, I shall act according to the suggestions of my own will and fancy. I shall first congratulate you, my friends, especially the enlightened part of my audience, as it has been *discriminately* called—I mean the Protestants of the company. I CONGRATULATE

them from my heart upon the re-appearance of their favourite, their redoubted champion once more in this scene of polemical discussion. I shall next congratulate my learned opponent (this favourite champion himself) inasmuch as he appears to me, if I may judge from appearances, rather refreshed and invigorated, than in the least impaired or exhausted by the vehement exertion of his lungs in that spacious *Æolian* mansion called Exeter Hall.—[Laughter.] [The reverend gentleman had been speaking on the Catholic question at the annual meeting of the British Reformation Society.] I name it *Æolian*, gentlemen, without the least reference to my learned and eloquent friend, who, as you all can witness, is very meek and gentle in his expressions towards us benighted Catholics!—Without the least reference to my learned friend, it may be most appropriately said of every one else who figures on that scene, in the language of the poet Virgil:—

“*Ille se jactet in aula*

Æolus, et clauso ventorum carcere regnet!”

Yes, my friends, on that scene, all the winds and waves of CATHOLICITY are commanded to be still, whilst reverend and sanctimonious calumniators, with the Bible in their hand, mount the stage in succession, one after another, to roar out their calumnies, and to disgorge all the virulence of invective against their neighbour and fellow-man.—[Sensation.] But, gentlemen, on this day we are met on very different terms; my learned opponent has to grapple with one who well knows how to reply to all his onsets, whether those onsets be of an argumentative, of a satirical, or calumniating nature. And, gentlemen, having mentioned the word calumniating, I am sorry to be obliged to inform my learned opponent—for whom I profess a real

sentiment of great esteem—I am sorry to be obliged to inform him that at the very outset of this disputation, and on the very last evening, he did utter against our holy religion a most unqualified and indefensible calumny; and it reflected great honour on the Catholic part of the audience that they were mindful of the sacred engagement which they were compelled to observe on entering this room; I say it reflected honour on them that they did not burst out into one general roar of indignation. My learned friend knows very well to what I allude; and it shows how barren he must have been, conscious as he was of deficiency in point of argument, when he declared that evening that he, forsooth, had *heard say* that a priest at a burial had gone about, cap in hand, asking for more money, in order to secure the repose of the departed soul [strong sensation and continued murmurs, when,]

JOHN KENDAL, Esq. (Catholic chairman) interfered, and at length established order, upon which,

Mr. FRENCH continued.—My Catholic brethren, do not forget yourselves: leave these mortal or venial sins, whatever they be, leave them to my antagonist. I need not inform my learned friend that *hearsay evidence* is proscribed by the laws of his country, that hearsay evidence is not admitted in a court of justice, which is so charitably introduced by my reverend friend in a polemical discussion. But the statement is false; and such a thing, if it had occurred, ought not to be mentioned, because it is, after all, but an instance of a priest overstepping the bounds of his duty. And where, I would ask, is there a religion, either in this or any other country, that cannot supply instances of priests or clergymen, (for there is in reality no priest but the

Catholic,) forgetful of their duty, both to God and their fellow-creatures?

Gentlemen, before I proceed to the systematic order which I intend to pursue this evening, I shall beg leave to advert to an extraneous subject. My learned friend has endeavoured to question my integrity (not directly, but in an implicated manner); it is with regard to a long and beautiful quotation from Sir Edwin Sandys. This said quotation I took out of a book in which there was no context; a book to which there was no name, which came to me seven or eight years ago. Whether written by a Protestant or Catholic, I know not; it was published by Sir Edwin Sandys, and the chapter and the page were given. I was astonished at it. I had never taken up Sir Edwin Sandys in my hands in my life. I took this extract, and I say it did honour to Sir Edwin Sandys to insert it in any work of his. I was astonished that he, a Protestant, had not endeavoured to sap the foundation of those powerful Catholic arguments. Well, gentlemen, I read to you an eloquent, a most transcendently eloquent classical production from Sir Edwin Sandys; and now I am given to understand that it came glowing from the lips of a Catholic, and was not an emanation from the mind of Sir Edwin. What is the consequence? My friend has given Sir Edwin Sandys *in propria persona*, and a more despicable specimen of vile trash and calumny never was poured forth from the mouth of a raving, illiterate itinerant. The passage from Sir Edwin Sandys, as there are many gentlemen may have never heard him, I shall beg leave to repeat again, and then ask, if there be not argument here worthy more serious refutation than that which it has

experienced from the pen of Sir Edwin Sandys.

"Now to discover this (Church)," says Sir Edwin Sandys, "let us reflect, that, except the Roman Church, and such others as are united to it, all other churches have had their end or decay long since, or their beginning but of late. This Church was founded by the prince of the Apostles, with a promise from Christ to him, that 'the gates of hell should never prevail against it,' (Matt. xvi. 18;) and that he himself would be assistant to it to the consummation of the world. It has now continued sixteen hundred years, with an honourable and certain line of nearly two hundred and forty popes, successors of St. Peter; tyrants, traitors, pagans and heretics, in vain raging, wresting, and undermining it. All the lawful and general councils that ever were in the world have, from time to time, approved and honoured it. God hath so miraculously blessed it from above, that many wise and learned doctors have enriched it with their writings; armies of saints with their holiness and virtues, armies of martyrs with their blood, and hosts of virgins with their purity, have sanctified and embellished it. Lastly, in all other opposite churches there are found inward dissensions and contrarieties, change of opinions, uncertainty of resolutions, rebelling against governors, confusion of orders: whereas, contrariwise, in this Church there is the unity undivided, the resolutions unaltered, the most heavenly order, reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection: all with admirable harmony and undefective correspondence bending the same way, to the effecting of the same work: all which do promise no other than a continual increase and victory.

"Wherefore, let no man doubt to submit himself to this glorious spouse of Christ.

"This, then, being accorded to be the true Church of God, it follows, that she be reverently obeyed in all things, without further inquisition; she having the warrant, that he that hears her, hears Christ; and whosoever hears her not, hath no better place with God than a publican or pagan. And what folly were it to receive Scriptures upon the credit of her authority, and not to receive the interpretation of them upon her authority also and credit!

"And if God should not always protect his Church from error, and yet peremptorily command men always to obey her, then had he made very slender provision for the salvation of mankind: which conceit concerning God (whose care of us, even in all things touching this transitory life, is so plain and evident,) would render us very ungratefully impious.

"And hard were the case, and mean had his regard been of the vulgar people, (whose wants and difficulties in this life, and whose capacities will not suffice to sound the deep and hidden mysteries of divinity, and to search the truth of intricate controversies,) if there were not others whose authority they might safely follow and rely upon. 'Blessed are they who believe and have not seen;' (John xx. 29,) the merit of whose religious humility and obedience exceeds perhaps in honour and acceptance before God, the subtle and profound knowledge of many others." Thus far Sir Edwin Sandys, a Protestant, in his *Europæ Speculum*.

And although he delivers these sentiments as being expressed by a Catholic, yet he leaves them without reply, and without endeavouring to

deny the truth of any thing therein contained.

Listen also to that renowned doctor of the Protestant Church, Dr. Jeremy Taylor; a man who, if splendour of genius can atone for the enormous crime of omitting to embrace that truth which shone so vividly in his eyes, will not be destitute of a very large reward in the kingdom of heaven.

"These following considerations (says he,) may very easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety, to maintain that which they know to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had actual possession and seizure of men's minds and understandings, before the *opposite professions* had a name. As, first, its doctrine having had a long continuance and possession of the Church, which, therefore, cannot easily be supposed in the present professors to be a design, since they have received it for so many ages. And it is not likely that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the several ends of divers ages.

"Secondly, its long prescription, which is such an advantage that it cannot, with many arguments, be retrenched; as relying upon these grounds: to wit, that truth is more ancient than falsehood; and that *God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church and leave her in error.*

"Again, the beauty and splendour of that Church, their solemn service, the stateliness and magnificence of their hierarchy, their name of *Catholic*, which they claim as their own due, and to concern no other sect of Christianity: the antiquity of their doctrine, the continual succession of their bishops, their immediate derivation from the apostles.

"Their title to succeed to St.

Peter, whose personal prerogatives were so great. The honourable expressions concerning this Church from many eminent bishops of other inferior sees, which being old records, have obtained a credibility.

"The multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion. Apparent consent with elder ages in matters doctrinal. The advantage which is derived to them, by retaining the doctrine of the Church of ancient times; the great consent of one part with another in that which they affirm to be *de fide*. The great differences which are commenced amongst their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying unto a very great licentiousness.

"Their happiness in being instrumental in converting divers nations. The advantage of monarchical government; and the benefit which they daily enjoy by it. The piety and the austerity of their religious orders of men and women. The single life of their priests and bishops. The riches of their Church; the severity of their fasts, and other their exterior observances.

"The great reputation of their bishops for faith and sanctity. The known holiness of some of those persons, whose institutes the religious persons do now imitate and follow.

"Their miracles. The casualties and accidents that have happened to many of their adversaries. The oblique acts and indirect proceedings of many of those who have departed from them.

"And, among many other things, the name of heretic and schismatic, which they fasten upon all that disagree with them," &c.

Such is the noble concession made to truth in a disinterested hour by Dr. Jeremy Taylor; a man whose keen, penetrating discern-

ment enabled him in a moment to pierce through the mists of surrounding error! And oh that words like his, glowing as they are with the spirit of truth, and calculated as they are to allure others to its sacred fountain, should have failed to produce the due effect in the mind of him that uttered them! How is this to be accounted for, is a question that can be solved only by the great Inspector of all hearts and actions. In the mean time, it cannot incur the imputation of being deficient in charity, if I observe, that had he possessed a sufficient contempt of earthly splendour to permit him wholly and exclusively to be enamoured of the celestial, beyond all doubt he would have lived and died exclaiming with a St. Augustine, "*Credo in unam Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam*"—"I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Such, gentlemen, is the glorious picture of that Church, the astonishing increase of which my learned friend and his fellow-cooperators at Exeter Hall are lamenting over in tears of anguish every time that they mount the stage! Yes; the increase of the CATHOLIC RELIGION in this country is going on daily and rapidly by the force of irresistible argument. No bribery; no finances; no violence; nothing but preaching the word of the living God by our pious and eloquent priests; and its progress is, thank God, not to be stopped by all the batteries of Exeter Hall.

Now, gentlemen, before I take up the regular series of argument which I intend to impress on you, I would remark, that as my learned friend has told you what his Rule of Faith is by successive demonstrations, surely it is highly incumbent upon you, my Protestant brethren, to inspect narrowly

whether those who translate the Bible do it fairly, accurately, and not with any sinister views and motives; and that, as the Bible is to be our guide to heaven, to take care that they do not minister to you poison instead of honey. I am not about to enter into an elaborate discussion this evening upon the various corruptions of the English New Testament and Old Testament; but I shall merely take one instance, which, on turning over rapidly the leaves no later than yesterday, struck me as the most indefensibly iniquitous translation that I ever met with in the course of my lifetime. I shall be happy to hear from my learned friend whether my interpretation meets with his assent from the original Hebrew?—[Turning to Mr. Cumming.] It is at Jer. xvii. 9:—"The heart is deceitful above all things, and unsearchable; who shall know it?"

But, if I were to enter more largely upon this particular field of argument on the present occasion, it would totally interrupt the order which I have laid down to myself. I merely give you this one as a specimen of the innumerable others which, upon a future occasion, I shall take the liberty of pointing out to you. The Protestant Bible runs thus: "The deceitfulness of the heart is above all things, and desperately wicked. Who can know it?" Now I maintain, that there is not a single word that could justify the insertion of "desperately wicked" in the original, and I appeal to my learned friend. And, therefore, my friends, if you do not meet with a satisfactory answer here from the original, what must be your opinion of that Bible? What will you say of it? What words more appropriate can you use to express the crime that has been committed by such a miscon-

struction, than by calling it "desperately wicked," the words foisted into the sacred volume?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Read the Douay Bible, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—I have not the Douay Bible here with me.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—That is it [pointing to a Bible on the platform-table].

Mr. FRENCH.—No, that is a Protestant.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Well; translate.

Mr. FRENCH.—Have *you* your Hebrew Bible with you?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No; I will bring it next time.

Mr. FRENCH.—There is a Hebrew gentleman in the room; he will translate it, I have no doubt, and you will be able to judge of its accuracy. [Here a gentleman of the name of Lyons advanced towards the platform].

Mr. FRENCH.—This gentleman will translate it from memory.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Have you got the Bible? I wish it from that —[To Mr. Lyons.]

Mr. LYONS.—I can give you the Hebrew, sir. The Bible they have gone to get.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Very well; I would rather wait, and have the Bible.

Mr. FRENCH.—[Addressing the aforesaid gentleman, Mr. Lyons.]—Is there a word of "desperately wicked" in it?

Mr. LYONS.—No, sir; no!

Mr. FRENCH.—Nothing that can at all justify the assertion?

Mr. LYONS.—[Retiring.]—None whatever. [Mr. Lyons then wrote out the passage in dispute on paper, in the original characters, which was handed over to the reverend gentleman. It appeared to be imperfect, having no points under the different characters; upon which]

Rev. J. CUMMING returned it, and said, "Will you point it, if you please? It is without points."

[Mr. Lyons, having pointed it correctly, returned it again, and nothing further ensued.]

Mr. FRENCH.—I shall mention one more instance, because it is a quotation which may be repeated during the course of this disputation this evening. It is this: "The priest's lips *shall* keep knowledge, and they *shall* seek the law of his mouth, for he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts."

The priests of the Church were the lawful interpreters of everything that was abstruse and difficult in the Bible, and the laity were proud to ask their interpretation at the hands of the priests. And so in the Christian Church, the priests are to be consulted as to everything therein appertaining to articles of faith. But here, in this false, indefensibly false and malignant interpretation of the Bible, which Englishmen call their Rule of Faith, we have men sitting down to draw upon themselves, wilfully and deliberately to draw down upon themselves, the maledictions imprecated in the book of Revelations upon those who shall alter or add unto the sacred volume. They translated it, "The priest's lips *should* keep knowledge; they should ask the law at his hands, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." Why, you might as well translate the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," by saying, "Thou *shouldst* not commit adultery." Is there no difference between *should* and *shall*? Is there anything in the original to countenance such a change?

[Mr. French having paused for an answer, received none.] And now, my friends, to show you how foolish this rule is, as to its acting alike upon all eyes, I shall abide by it

this evening; at least, for some time. I will adopt the rule of my learned friend. I will take it in hand, and see if it speaks alike to all persons. I understand perfectly well a rule of Greek or Latin grammar, or English grammar, and I find it speaks the same language to all persons, and you can instantly make it square and tally whenever you wish either to speak or write grammatically. There is the same analogy between a scriptural rule and a literary rule. I take certain texts, and I wish to make my deductions therefrom, without permitting myself to be dictated to by my learned friend. I shall, therefore, take in hand a few texts I noted down, and which elicited such rapturous applause from the *enlightened* part of his audience on the last evening of discussion, when, he having the last word, I was obliged to leave several of his texts quoted against the doctrine of Purgatory totally unanswered. First, Ezekiel xviii. 21, 22:—"But if the wicked will turn from all his sins which he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him; in his generation, in his righteousness that he hath done, he shall live." Now, observe here, even in this it is not faithfully translated, for it is not so in the original; it is, "Shall not be remembered unto him." I do not say there is anything softened, or at all overstated, in it; still they might as well have adhered literally to the original as wandering from it. Now, I answer, (according to my reading of the Old and New Testament,) that "not to remember," in the language of sacred writ, is *not to bear an eternal enmity against the perpetrators of sin*. And I am justi-

fied in arguing in this manner when I look at it in sacred writ; when I look at the case of David, whose sins were forgiven him, because of the sincerity of his extraordinary repentance. Still there was punishment, temporal punishment, to be inflicted on him, which the holy prophet endured with patience and resignation; and you would find that it can mean nothing else, if my learned friend had cast his eyes down a little lower, where it says, (ver. 24):—"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be *mentioned* or *remembered*: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." This alludes to the circumstance of such a man's misdeeds not hindering him from incurring the torments of eternal fire. Still, gentlemen, his good deeds, should he repent, are not to be taken from him; his good deeds were to be remembered in this life. So were his misdeeds, should he repent, to be forgiven. Still, by the same analogy, some punishment is due to these, as some reward to the former. But it is difficult, in a passage of this nature, to come to any precise meaning. I am not certain, and my friend is not certain, as to its meaning. There must be some tribunal to refer to, not as to the interpretation of particular texts, but as to *general meaning*; there must be a CHURCH to point out its true interpretation for the reception of men, under pain of their becoming "heathen men and publicans;" that is, destitute of all hopes of eternal life. And it is a very extraordinary thing, my friends, that it never entered into the imagination of my

learned friend, when he gave us his peremptory interpretations, that this, so-and-so, is "destructive of the whole doctrine of Purgatory," and when stamping his foot in so authoritative a manner, and saying, "There, my friends, there is Christianity," with as much pomp and infallibility, surely, as the Pope ever assumed—[laughter]—when he did that, did it never enter into the conjectural fancy of my learned friend, to invent some plausible reason why the fathers of the Church before the sixteenth century, who studied the Bible from morning to night, never lighted on that very ingenious passage? It is, certainly, one of the most luminous discoveries of modern perspicacity, in applying texts to the subversion of dogmas as old as Christianity itself.

Again, Eccles. ix. 5:—"For the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." Now this appeared to my friend a most triumphant and conclusive argument against the doctrine of Purgatory. Now, consider, this is said by King Solomon, in reference to those materialists who not only take away Purgatory, but hell, and who think there is nothing beyond this life; who imagines, as Sallust has put it into the mouth of Cæsar, that death is the entire end of man; that death is the final extinguishment of all human calamity; that beyond that goal there is neither room for joy nor grief.

"Mortem, ærumnarum finem esse, non cruciatum; ultra, neque gaudio neque luctui locum esse."

It is of the character of the atheist and voluptuary that Solomon is here speaking; he is not giving arguments to my learned friend here to destroy the doctrine of Purgatory by any means. But it is a very remarkable thing, my friends, that this

very identical passage of the Bible which my learned friend imagines to be so absolutely destructive and annihilative of Purgatory, has been singled out by a French philosopher, the celebrated Diderot, as the only sensible part of the Bible comprehending his doctrine: "Après moi le déluge;"—when man dies he is nothing else but "*a corporeal clod*." So felicitous, upon all occasions, is my learned and ingenious friend in his application of texts in support of his novel system—texts which have been anticipated by *heretics* in one age, and by *atheists* in another, in corroboration of their respective doctrines.

The next is, Eccles. iii. 3:—"If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth: and if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth there shall it lie." I have heard this, my friends, from many an old woman before, as crushing to the doctrine of Purgatory; and as I laughed at the old women, so, in a good-natured manner, I shall smile at my learned friend. [Laughter.] For, look you: it says in the first place, "If the tree fall toward the south or toward the north," or towards whatever place (*quocunque loco*), there let it lie; so that it appears there is a *third* place, and that it is not confined to either the north or the south. But here I answer, that literally the wise man is talking of corporeal death. He means to say, Such and such a man must die, and that when he is dead, he shall never rise again; as the wood falls and there remains, and rots in the spot where it fell. But let us suppose that it does make against the doctrine of Purgatory. What then? Why it proves *too much*! because it proves that there can be no place to which it bears reference but that

which common sense tells me it refers to, viz. to nothing but this world. If it did, it would overturn the teaching of the Gospel, where we are informed (whether it be Abraham's bosom, or whether it be the imaginary place of Calvin and his bright disciples), that there was a place where the souls of the fathers were detained before the ascension of our blessed Lord to heaven. Any other supposition would destroy that place, together with the unquestionable veracity of the Bible! So happy is my reverend friend, on all occasions, when he appeals to these his invincible texts—those texts which make one part, I mean the “enlightened” part of his congregation, as they have discriminately been called, to forget their veracity, and burst out into raptures of applause.

The next is, Matt. xxv. 33:—“And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left.” And again, mark, “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be damned.” I answer, that I am certain—more certain here than I have been in any other place, because the whole chapter will bear me out—the evangelist is alluding here to the last judgment, and if my reverend friend reads it with attention, he will come to the same conclusion. And, of course, then, Purgatory will be at an end; and as the whole chapter alludes to the last judgment, surely it can make nothing in favour of my learned friend's positions.

The next was Luke, where the thief said, “Lord, remember me in paradise.” I answer here, in the first place, that, according to what the thief utters, the impression of the Jews was that there was to be another place. Because he says, “When thou comest into thy king-

dom,” as he was on the point of expiring. He must have expected to *wait somewhere* until our blessed Lord did ascend into heaven; but he says, “This *day* shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Now, I answer—[here some slight noise occurred, when the learned gentleman paused to request silence,]—and that, too, at a time when he was suffering the most excruciating death with patience and resignation.

We maintain, in the Catholic Church, that a man who has committed many sins, and is sincere in his contrition, is contrite for having offended so good and holy a God—such contrition as David felt—that, without reference to punishment, his sins are blotted out; and that, in all probability, since the death of our Redeemer, such a soul would go straight to heaven. But we do not think such conversions are common among enormous sinners; and we do think—we think, in consonance with every man who consults the great laws of nature and religion, as interpreted by the Church of Ages—that it would have the appearance of a great injustice, if a man, one who has cultivated piety with the utmost care and solicitude all the days of his life, and kept his thoughts, and words, and deeds pure, and adored his God with all the ardour of his soul, calling incessantly on the name of the blessed and immortal Jesus, that there should be no distinction, I say, between him and the sinner who has spent all the days of his life in the haunts of debauchery, and that, because he happens to be visited with compunction at a time when he feels the power of gratification as it were extinguished; at the moment, I say, that the man who lived a filthy monster dies, that he is fit for the association and companionship of angels. [Suppressed

applause.] No, I can never believe it. We are forbidden to believe it by the Church of Ages, and common sense alike forbids it. But such a doctrine will go down with the *Calvinists*, who think all sin equal; who think that venial sin is of a damning nature. We know very well that, without the blood of the blessed Saviour, no sin can be blotted out; but that it is by the benefit of that precious blood that all sins, be they mortal or venial, are washed away. But there must be an invariable and eternal distinction between mortal and venial sin. A contrary doctrine would be totally incompatible with the existing laws of society. Indeed, it was on this account that made the city of Berne pass a decree to the effect that Calvin's doctrine should not be taught in that city.

Gentlemen, I have one more observation that, until now, has escaped me. I have to allude to an extract made by my friend from Cardinal Baronius. I am astonished, my friends, that my learned opponent should allude to that subject, when it is a charge that recoils on all the Christian sects in this country. If the circumstance of having bad priests among the fold vitiates the characteristics and fundamentals of religion, what religion, I would ask, can stand the test of examination? It reflects great honour on Cardinal Baronius, in painting the enormities of the Pope, which, unless the Catholic Church had handed them down to posterity, my learned friend would have been probably unacquainted with. But will my learned friend tell me, that if Judas the apostle had lived, and had conferred a sacrament, that the efficacy of that sacrament would have been invalidated because Judas Iscariot was a bad man? Will my learned friend

tell me at the present day—(I am merely speaking to those who think baptism necessary to salvation)—I would ask if in this process of baptism, (a doctrine virtually inculcated by my learned friend), if the baptismal water poured over us would be *vitiating* by the contaminated hands that poured it, if the priest was bad? Why, you would shake the very foundation of the Christian religion by introducing such a doctrine. What! my friend says there were “bad popes,” and Cardinal Baronius has the candour to acknowledge it. I acknowledge that there were bad ones; I acknowledge that out of the two hundred and fifty popes that have been, there have been twenty of questionable character, and that we have had some six or seven enormously bad and wicked. I acknowledge it. And it is, moreover, a well-attested fact, that the most wicked of these popes administered the Church in the strictest and most careful manner, with the exception of those occasions where he wanted to introduce his relatives and friends to power; but in the general superintendence of the Church, no one article of the faith was altered—no false morality was inculcated; and a remarkable thing it is that the historians who have recorded his deeds have handed it down as a fact, that if the bad and virtuous men presented themselves before him as candidates for place, he having no favourite in view upon the occasion, he uniformly rejected the bad, and received the good men. But we must all renounce the idea of religion, if we expect to find the Church unpolluted by bad persons. There was *one* bad one among the apostles, and, of course, there will be more now that the blessed Saviour has retired from his Church. You have read that

Caiaphas voted for the death of the blessed Redeemer: he cried out to the Jews to shed the blood of Christ. And Caiaphas, who gave this counsel to the Jews, was high-priest; but, nevertheless, he joined in Christ's death. And yet Caiaphas, because he was the high-priest that year, actually prophesied; and yet a more contaminated wretch cannot exist than the man who could cry for the shedding of blood so pure, so incomparably innocent. Caiaphas, that abominable and polluted monster, prophesied, and why? Because he was the high-priest that year; the temporary high-priest. And mark! Is the high-priest for life, the Pope of Rome, the first bishop of the Christian world, is he incapacitated from conferring the blessings of every sacrament, and superintending the spiritual affairs of the whole world, because he may be a bad man? No! it is quite clear that popes are peccable; that is, liable to sin. We think the Pope is fallible in judgment, and we attribute to him no impeccability in moral living. We only think that the Church, the assembled council of Catholic Bishops, with the Pope at their head, and the Pope having only a casting voice in that council, is infallible: we do pronounce decrees emanating from such a body to be infallible. Every thing else in the way of objection to his power is utter loss of time on the part of my learned friend. I know there are some divines of the Church of Rome, who think that the Pope, with regard to faith, is infallible. I am here this day, not to answer for private opinions, but to defend our articles of faith. If I believe the Pope infallible, I do not sin; but I am bound, under pain of sin, to believe a general council with the Pope at its head, to be infallible.

There are some of the Catholic divines who have asserted it: we do not believe it; it is not an article of our faith; it is rather repugnant to our faith. But now, my friends, I shall have very little time to speak upon the subject called the Rule of Faith. However, I shall make a beginning. I read when I open this Bible, the golden Rule of Faith laid down by my learned friend: when I open the Bible I read for myself, without any assistance of commentaries on the Ancient or New Testament, and I perceive most clearly that God Almighty in the Old Testament predicted that all nations—all Gentile nations—should be converted to the religion of his Son; and predicted it by the voice of many a holy prophet. I see these prophecies repeated in the New Testament. They are many in number; and I shall content myself with two or three that appear to me, in my selection, the most conspicuous, and which I shall just have time to mention. The first is, Psalm ii. 6—8. "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill in Zion. I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee *the heathen for thine inheritance*, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." The next is Psalm xxii. 27:—"All the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." The next is Isaiah lii. 10:—"The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the sight of all the nations: and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." The next is Isaiah lx. 11:—"Therefore thy gates shall be open continually: they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring

unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." The next is Ezekiel xxxvii. 27:—"Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them: it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore." The next is Hosea iii. 23:—"And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people, and they shall say, Thou art my God." I see here most clearly the Church of God predicted. And then I turn to St. Matthew xxviii. 19:—"Go ye and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Now, my friends, that religion is to be esteemed the true one, and consequently to be embraced, into which and by which all nations were baptized. "Go teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," says Christ. I mention this, because our Lord so often promised in Scripture—so often promised this conversion to the one true faith and worship of God—a promise which has been fulfilled. But the religion by which "all nations" have been converted—and mark this very attentively, for,

if I mistake not, I shall obtain a very illustrious triumph over my reverend friend this evening—the religion by which "*all nations*" have been converted is the CATHOLIC RELIGION, and therefore there can be no doubt that this is the TRUE ORIGINAL RELIGION of Christianity. Such, my friends, is my deep-sounding logic, in contradistinction to my reverend friend's perpetually-revolving chime and *tinkling cymbal* of vain oratory.

Let us begin our investigation on this point with this century and the two last. Look at China. Look at the indefatigable efforts of the Jesuits to christianize that country; look at other nations of the world where martyrs have fertilized the soil with blood out of the bosom of the Catholic Church. Even your own Protestant reviewers—the "*Quarterly Review*," and "*Blackwood's Magazine*," that malignant and anti-Catholic review, acknowledges that the Jesuits have entered into China, and have performed wonders there worthy of a better cause; whilst they say that the Methodists and the Churchmen have not been able so much as to enter. Yes, my friends, but Blackwood takes great care not to tell you of the *hundreds of thousands* of priests who have been stretched on crucifixes for Jesus in that infidel country. No; they keep all that in the background, and in silence.

He does not tell you, that no later than last year, two eminently, super-eminently pious Dominicans, both bishops, laid down their lives in attestation of that Bible concerning which ye are so perpetually canting, and doing nothing more. He does not tell you that Jesuits (the very name of which amongst you is a name of obloquy) proved themselves, when stretched upon the rack and the crucifix, worthy of

all your calumniating tongues, by being Jesuits *indeed*; that is, dying for that Jesus, whose name, whose cause, the whole order since its foundation has ever so gloriously illustrated by the splendour of their learning and the innocency of their lives.

Lastly, he does not tell you that numbers of the secular clergy, men of sanctity and learning, not to be surpassed by the orders to which I have alluded, welcomed all the horrors of death with inconceivable joy and ardour, in order to seal their doctrines with their blood.

I say it not out of reproach to any one, but the Catholic, as the fact is, is in every age alike; ay, even at the present moment taking up the crucifix, which he deeply venerates, and upon which ye impiously trample, and, with that sacred image of his dying Saviour riveted in his heart and in his hand, is ever busied in converting barbarous nations to the living God, in defiance of racks and tortures, and all the sanguinary horrors of death in every shape and form. But if we look to your missionaries, what are they doing? Why, they are canting from morning to night, not only here, but in every distant shore, about the holiness of the Bible—a book, which they have not the fortitude of soul sufficient to vindicate with the celestial magnanimity of martyrs, by shedding their blood with joy in attestation of its veracity, and of their love for Him by whom it was inspired.

Let us now examine the successive ages of the Church; for that religion must necessarily be the true one, and ought consequently to be the object of universal adhesion on the part of every sincere investigator into the truth of things; the Lord God having often promised in Scripture this conversion

of nations to the true faith and worship; which promise must most undeniably be fulfilled.

Psalm ii. 8.—“Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.”

Again, Hosea ii. 23. —“And I will say to them which are not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.”

Again, St. Mark xvi. 15.—“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”

Again, most conspicuously, St. Luke xxiv. 45.—“Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures.”

Ibid. xli. —“And said unto them, Thus it is written,” &c.

Ibid. xlvii.—“And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached *among all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem.”

This, therefore, my Protestant friends, being so clearly and intelligibly laid down in Scripture, the religion, I contend, to which all nations in all ages have been and still are converted is the Catholic, or, as ye call it, the Roman Catholic religion; a *non est inventa* having been returned by the Christian investigator, as to any one of your variegated sects during the lapse of nearly fifteen centuries. *Ergo*, there can be no doubt that this is the true religion of Christ—the true prop and bulwark of the Bible, verifying and illustrating all its glorious predictions by its ever-flowing perpetuity, its unintermitted stability, in preserving and in expounding all the articles of faith.

And now, my friends, to prove all this, turn we from the present, the nineteenth century, to the eighteenth, and so let us mount upwards from century to century, until we reach

the apostolic age, gathering as we ascend all the laurels to be gained by converting nations into the lap of Catholicity. Having first called your attention to this fact, that no later than last year Jesuits and Dominicans, "with a fortitude worthy of a better cause" (to use the words of the virulently anti-Catholic "Blackwood's Magazine"), have been found gloriously shedding their blood in the cause of their blessed Redeemer, even in China; "where," says the same writer, "Protestant missionaries have not as yet been able to enter."

Let us begin our investigation of this point with the fifteenth, or rather sixteenth century, and trace up our tenets, with their diffusion through Christendom, to the sixth century.

In the fifteenth or sixteenth century you behold the standard of the cross planted in the Indies and in Japan by the illustrious St. Francis Xavier, whose life has been written by our immortal Dryden, after his conversion to the Catholic faith.

You behold it spreading in the same age in China, besides in many islands of the Indian seas.

You behold the missionaries that spread it, suffering year after year cruel, bitter privations of every description, both as to all the necessities and the comforts of life; you behold them suffering the rack, and tortures of every description, in the sacred cause of our Lord Jesus.

In the fourteenth century, you behold a single missionary, St. Vincent, surnamed Ferrerius, converting to the Catholic faith five-and-twenty thousand, partly Jews and partly Saracens, as testifies St. Antoninus, a celebrated writer of that age.—3 V. Hist. tit. 23, cap. viii. sect. 4.

In the thirteenth century vast

numbers were converted to the Catholic faith in the kingdom of Tartary, by two friars sent thither from the Pope, in the reign of the emperor of Tartary, who is called the great Cam, as you may read in Paulus Venetius, a writer of those times.

In the twelfth century the people of Norway were converted to the Roman faith by Adrian the Fourth. This Adrian the Fourth was an Englishman called Nicholas Breakstaff, and spread the Gospel in that country, namely, Norway, before his election to the Apostolic See.

In the eleventh century were the Hungarians for the most part converted, and bishops ordained and appointed there by the Pope of Rome, at the request of their king, Stephen, afterwards canonized; all which we find recorded in the centuriators of Magdeburg.—Cent. 2, cap. ii.

In the tenth century we behold many provinces converted to the Roman faith by the endeavours of Henry the First, Emperor Adelbert, and Methodius, Archbishop of Bohemia, as testify the Protestant centuriators above-mentioned.—Cent. 10, cap. ii.

In the ninth century you behold the Vandals, Bulgarians, Slavonians, Polonians, with those of Denmark and Moravia, converted to the faith, and united to the Romish Church.—Cent. 9, cap. viii.

In the eighth century was converted a great part of Germany to the Roman faith by St. Boniface, sent thither for that purpose by Pope Gregory the Second, according to the Protestant centuriators.—Cent. 8, cap. ii.

In the seventh age were converted the people of Franconia, or Franck-Country, by St. Kilian, sent thither from the Pope of Rome also, as you will find by referring to the

same Protestant centuriators. — Cent. 7, cap. ii.

In the sixth century (and, oh! my countrymen, can ye hear it without a tear of gratitude, under God, to your great converter Gregory,) were Englishmen converted to the Roman faith by holy, pure, austere-living, luxury-trampling monks, sent hither on that sublime errand by the angelic Pope above mentioned.

Finally, the people of Brabant, Flanders, Holland, Friesland, Westphalia, France, and other adjoining nations, by whom were they converted? Were they not converted by the disciples of the Roman Church; namely, by St. Servatius, St. Eloy, St. Rumwold, St. Amandus, St. Vedastus, St. Levin, St. Remigius, St. Willebrord, St. Swibert, St. Wulfranc, and others, who were all staunch members of the Roman Church, the only Church on earth that has any title to the name Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic?

It is evidenced, therefore, my friends, by uncontested Protestant history, that all nations that have been converted from Paganism or Judaism to Christ Jesus, for so many centuries past, were converted to the Catholic faith, and incorporated in that Roman Church against which ye unanimously protest, as being sunk in damnable idolatry and damnable superstition.

But, I ask you, my friends, who is there in this assembly that, maturely considering these things, can entertain the shadow of a doubt but that the Catholic religion is the real, the genuine religion of the blessed, the lovely, the adorable, the immortal Jesus?

Tell me, my friends, do we not in this her sublime, unwearied journey through the track of centuries before the professors of her creed ye hold were ever heard of, do we not see

fulfilled to the very letter, God's divine promise of the conversion of nations?

Behold, my friends, so many remote nations taking refuge in her sacred bosom — so many patent kingdoms forsaking their idolatry; abandoning all impurity of life; rejecting their multitude of wives; forgetting their barbarous and savage manners; banishing all their former unrestrained licentiousness of morals, to become meek and tractable, and bending with the docility of infants under the sweet yoke of Christ Jesus; voluntarily trampling under foot their former highmindedness and pride, in order to taste the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom; and, in one word, becoming estranged from the love of terrestrial things, in order to become wholly absorbed and inflamed with love of the celestial.

How is it possible that that religion should be false and impious, or, as my reverend opponent would say, in his soft and Christian phraseology, should be blasphemous or damnable idolatrous, that can effect such a wonderful supernatural mutation in the hearts of barbarian nations?

To conclude: How is it possible that Divine Providence should permit all these nations to be deceived for such a length of years, and especially after they had forsaken their idolatry, so heartily embraced the Gospel, and united themselves to what they deemed to be the Church of Christ? — no Church of England then, no Lutherans, no Calvinists, no Anabaptists, no Quakers, no Irvingites, having as yet been either born or heard of.

Is it possible, I say, that God Almighty should thus have plunged those nations, just emerging as they were from the sanguinary lustrations of Druidism, into the depths

of other abominable errors, and into the pollution of new idolatry?

And, oh! most unaccountable in the ways of Providence, that He should have permitted all this by the instrumentality of men holy, just, and pure; yes, men renowned in their generation for unsullied sanctity of life, wisdom, and, according even to the confession of Protestant Milner, for the gift of miracles.

[The learned gentleman's hour here terminated.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I am sure, my Christian hearers, that if my learned and persevering antagonist had brought a pair of globes into this assembly, and had given you a lecture on astronomy, he would just have done as much to elucidate the Rule of Faith as he has achieved by the speech with which he has now engaged your attention. You heard the various distinctions and illustrations I adduced upon the subject; you heard the positions that I successfully established respecting the corruption of the Church of Rome; respecting, I say, the corruption of the channels through which a portion of his Rule of Faith has flowed. You heard me call on my learned friend to lay down his Rule of Faith by the side of mine; to show it; to adduce it. Where is it? *My* Rule of Faith lies fully and fairly before you—there it is, the BIBLE. I laid it down. Where is the Romanist's? Where is Mr. French's?—Echo answers, *Where?* It is not to be found. Like "infallibility," when most wanted it is most missing. I called upon him in the next place to show some just and satisfactory evidence that my grave and solemn assertion was untrue when I alleged, as I do now, that the whole structure of Roman

Catholic Infallibility, and other assumptions, is based upon the use and interpretations of private judgment. If *it* be unworthy of trust, so is infallibility. He *has not* answered it. In short, if this assembly is content to have the hour set apart for the discussion of a particular topic, taken up by *elaborately written out and prepared, and separate, and totally distinct subjects*, why then, indeed, we are met for a purpose which I did not contemplate at all in the arrangements which were made in opening this discussion. But if we are met in this assembly for the individual who rises up to *reply* to the person who has preceded him, then I do protest that my learned antagonist has wandered away, in consequence of his written speech, from the whole subject of this evening's discussion. He has dragged in and discussed Exeter-hall; he has dragged in all the orators of last week, (the speakers at the different May meetings,) whose accents are evidently, and with effect, ringing in his ears; he has dragged in Purgatory, in which he seems to have been spending the last ten days in evident and incessant torture; he has brought in, in short, every subject and every question abroad in the world of controversy, save and except the RULE OF FAITH, which is the subject of this evening's discussion. Now you see that I am placed in an extraordinary dilemma. If I reply to the farrago which he has brought forward, *de multis rebus et quibusdam aliis*, I shall not only have to submit to this assembly the most extraordinary and extensive range of researches ever laid before you, but also to leave unbroken the Romish Rule of Faith. But I cannot afford to consume my time on such irrelevant trash—in rapid

egotism, which has nothing to do with the question. Purgatory has once for all been sealed and settled, I would trust, to the satisfaction of my learned friend, on a preceding evening; and if he has felt all the pangs and the agonies resulting from the explosion of that unholy and unscriptural dogma, he must put up with them, for he has only plunged himself deeper into mysticism and perplexity by the renewed reference which he has this evening made to it. I must say I do not choose to enter Mr. French's Purgatory to-night; I will not allow myself to be driven from the real question, and dragged into it. He knows full well what is coming in the Rule of Faith; he knows what a rod there is in pickle for him, and is most anxious to get a comfortable opportunity of escaping under cover of some of the monstrous dogmas of his Church, in order to enjoy a comfortable sleep this night, if he is not destined to do so after Thursday evening. But yet do kindly excuse me, while for one minute I help my tormented opponent out of Purgatory. He quoted two texts which I adduced on a preceding evening. He first stated that Purgatory is *purifying*, or that it purifies us from our sins: and secondly, that it is *penal*; or that it inflicts punishment for sin, and that consequently those who commit venial sin endure its burning punishment after death.

In the first place, my opponent says, Purgatory is *purifying*. I answer, That if Scripture be true, there is no such place or process *hereafter*; and that the only Purgatory recognised in Scripture is that present and now accessible Purgatory in which every, even the guiltiest, Roman Catholic may this evening plunge — "*the blood of Jesus which cleanseth from all sin.*"

In reference to his second idea of Purgatory, that it is *penal*, or that there is a place of torture for the *ransomed after* they have departed this life, I reply, Scripture quashes it. The apostle Paul has distinctly declared, "I long to be *absent* from the body and *present* with the Lord." And again, a voice from heaven cries, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord: yea, saith the Spirit, for henceforth *they rest from their labours*, and their works do follow them." "There is *no* condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." And again, the apostle says, "Whilst I am absent from the body I am *present with the Lord*." Again, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have" (not *Purgatory*) "*a building of God; a house not made with hands*, eternal in the heavens."—All these texts denote, *without* interval, transition from earth to glory.

But Purgatory is not the question, and with these short and simple replies to it I leave it, I dismiss it. My opponent denies the fact which I adduced respecting the Irish priest; I merely reply that the facts shall be substantiated by proper evidence when and where he pleases. But he says, even if the fact be true, every church may in this way be charged with the bad conduct of her priests. I simply alluded to the principle which that priest in particular exemplified, and made no allusion to the general practices of the priests of the Church of Rome. But I assert, that priest's conduct was the just and legitimate fruit of Purgatory principles. He acted consistently with his creed.

In the next place, he said he had been deceived in quoting from Sir Edwin Sandys. It may have been so, though odd. I stated that Sir

Edwin Sandys, of his own free will, gave the "best and fairest" exhibition of the Church of Rome that he could. He then added, "Now 'this is the best and fairest' picture of the Church of Rome that she herself can sketch." It was not his opinion of her. He gave his own opinion of the popedom in the most exterminating accents. But, you observe, Mr. French claimed Sir Edwin Sandys' apostolical picture of the Church of Rome as a testimony to her glory, and thereby practically confirmed the remark that I made, that there is great difficulty in detecting the advocates of the Church of Rome when they thus err, when through misfortune or infirmity they pervert any passage they may happen to select. And I would add, that Mr. French is not the only or the first person who has been curiously deceived in quoting such passage. *He* is not the first. It happened to be quoted also just in the same moment many years ago by Father M'Guire, and the Rev. Mr. Pope happened to detect the fallacy. So that, you observe, the advocates of the Church of Rome are frequently liable to misinterpret on these occasions, and their blunder may not very easily be detected by an audience, and hence hundreds of Roman Catholics imbibe statements as true which are notoriously false. The next quotation of my opponent was a favourite one from our Bible. Now what is the passage?—"The heart of man is desperately wicked." The original is here. It is literally translated in our authorized version, and in the Douay it is not far wrong. 'Unsearchable' is not the translation of the Hebrew; though, if it be viewed as applying to its deceitfulness, it is expressive enough; so deep and unfathomable that you cannot get a plummet to

fathom it. Nothing could better express the Protestant idea than this. "Its deceitfulness is unsearchable, it is unfathomable, nothing can reach it; who can know it?"—that is to say, God is describing the wickedness of the human heart, and he says, "It is so wicked and so deceitful that no ascent can reach its height, no plumb-line its depth. It is *unsearchable* in its depravity."

MR. FRENCH—(*Hurriedly.*)—Not at all. [We presume as an objection to Mr. Cumming's interpretation. But the reverend gentleman was too much taken up with his train of argument to hear it.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—Now these are *strong* expressions to denote the wickedness of the human heart. If the Protestant version has at all erred in rendering it "desperately wicked," I will show you by and by that it has erred on the side of lenity and softness, and not on the side of severity. I contend that the language of the Church of Rome, if referred to the heart's depravity, is as expressive as the Protestant rendering, while not so accurate: "It is unsearchable: who can know it?"

I read the whole of the parallel passages, and it is described, "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose *heart* departeth from the Lord." God has described the wickedness of the human heart, and all experience tells us that the severest terms are not too much so. Our translation of the original is not so powerful as it might have been. If our translation is erroneous, it errs on the side of tenderness; on the side of lenity, and not of reprobation and severity. But this is dangerous ground to tamper with, and I do believe that if ever there was a convincing evidence of the beauty and excellence

of the Protestant translation, it is furnished by the paltry objection Mr. French is pleased to adduce, and to denounce as a Protestant "perversion," as he calls it. In the mean time let me say that the merits of the authorized version have been the subject of frequent eulogia. I have here an extract from the celebrated Dr. Doyle, who pronounces the Protestant version to be one of the *noblest* versions of the Bible ever *executed*.

MR. FRENCH.—[Turning to Mr. Cumming.]—Be so good as to read the words, if you please.

REV. J. CUMMING.—[Referring to the said extract.]—He says, "a very noble work."—[Turning to Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—[Smiling.]—Yes! I grant you, as to style; that is what he means.

REV. J. CUMMING.—[In continuation.]—That is Mr. French's theory. Now, the next passage to which my learned antagonist referred (for as our Rule of Faith is invulnerable, he has no other alternative than to nibble at our translation) is Malachi ii. 7. He says justly, our rendering of the passage is, "For the lips of the priest *should* keep knowledge;" but incorrectly that the rendering of the Douay, which is "*shall*," is the right one. If you mean to imply that his lips shall *so* keep knowledge that he shall never err, which must be the import if "*shall*" is right, the context will show you your error. Then the difference may be reconciled—[turning to Mr. French]. I beg Mr. French's particular attention to this. What, I would ask, is the difference between *shall* and *should*? You observe, my antagonist wants to construct upon this passage a *principle*, viz. that *the priests are to be the depositary of knowledge, that we*

should go to them for instruction. That is his principle. The difference between *shall* and *should* is mere bagatelle here. But mark what follows: "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts. But ye (*i.e.* priests) *are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts.*" And there are a thousand other passages to elucidate this; such as, "Ye have made void the law of God," &c. So that our translation in using *should* gave the plain and explicit meaning of the passage, whereas the Douay translation embodies a direct contradiction. "*Should*" denotes duty on the part of the priests, which the next verse proves them to have neglected. "*Shall*" is absolute futurity or prophecy, and, if correct rendering, then God's word has not been fulfilled, as the succeeding words show. Our translation merely makes man a sinner; the Douay makes God a liar. Which is true? If I take the Protestant version, I discover that it contains in the one verse a declaration of the duty of the priests, and in the following, a declaration of their declension from their duty; and here, as you will find in every passage my opponent will quote, he falls into his own trap. But he knows there are *more* priests besides the priests of Levi to whom the awful declaration is appended, "Ye have made void the law of heaven by the *traditions* of men." But, I repeat, translations and their comparative merits are *dangerous* ground for him to meddle with; and I will give you, among many, this reason for it. You are aware that Sixtus the Fifth, not satisfied with the translation furnished in the old

Latin Vulgate, had (as he called it) "a correct edition" made and published at Rome, anno Domini 1590; and this edition, you will observe, was pronounced by infallibility to be *so* correct, that, if I am not mistaken, an anathema was appended to it against any one "who should alter that edition, or make a change, in *minima particula*;" an anathema was attached to any one who should dare to make an alteration in the text which enjoyed the imprimatur of Pope Sixtus the Fifth, in the *minutest* particular. Well, was this attended to? Not at all. Pope Clement the Eighth, being dissatisfied with many a *minima* and *maxima particula* of this edition of Sixtus, got *another* printed in anno Domini 1592; and between the two there were some three thousand, or, at fewest, two thousand discrepancies! One pope, whom the Italian pronounces to be "infallible," sends out one edition of the Bible, and threatens with excommunication all who dare to alter it; and another pope, also pronounced "infallible," declares that there were at least two thousand blunders in the edition of his infallible predecessor! And, in order to show the minute discrepancy between the two, clauses were omitted in the Sixtine edition, but inserted in the Clementine. Nine passages were infallibly omitted by the one pope in his, and infallibly added by the other; and both pronounce an anathema against any who shall make an alteration. Then there were clauses inerrably introduced into the Sixtine, which the Clementine inerrably omitted. There are at least thirteen passages which relate to some of the Acts of the Apostles, which were introduced into the Sixtine, and omitted in the Clementine. Then there were manifest *contradictions* between the

infallibles. For instance: the Sixtine edition had infallibly "*thine*," and the Clementine had infallibly "*mine*;" the Sixtine had "*us*," and the Clementine "*thee*;" the one had "WITHIN" and the other had "WITHOUT."

Then, if we go to difference of numbers; the one (the Sixtine) had in one text *twelve walls*, the other (the Clementine) makes mention of none at all.

The Sixtine has thirty thousand in one passage where the Clementine has forty thousand. Surely, a Roman Catholic, even, may see that if thirty thousand be infallibly right, forty thousand must be infallibly wrong, and therefore that one of the popes was fallible.

Again, one edition spoke of the *five* churches, the other of *fifty*; and there are many other differences of a most extraordinary kind; so that "those who live in glass houses should be very cautious how they throw stones." There were two passages to which my learned antagonist objected; the force of which objections, I confess, I am obtuse enough not to perceive. I refer to his quotation from Ezekiel xviii. 21, "If the wicked man will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live: he shall not die." This text, (I know not what bearing it has on the Rule of Faith,) he asserts is contradictory to verse 24 in the same chapter: "But when the righteous man turneth away from his own righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned." The two passages explain each other. There is no difficulty. If the wicked man, turning from the error of his way,

believing in Christ as set forth in the sacrifices of Levi, leaning on him for acceptance, and looking to him for forgiveness—if he do so, he is saved; but the man who has once walked uprightly, and again falls into an open course of sin, after a life of apparent Christian consistency and professed devotedness to God, that man, notwithstanding the previous credit or reality of his virtues, shall die, because he dies in a state of estrangement from God, and thereby evidences his rejection of the only atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ. But these two passages bear nothing on the Rule of Faith; they are mere plans of spinning out the time. They are neither argument on the one side nor the other. I cannot understand for what reason, save for that I have given, my learned antagonist was pleased to quote them.

He next *assumed*, (not proved, or attempted to prove, for this is not his forte,) most quietly and comfortably to himself, that the Church of Rome is *the* Catholic Church. Now this I utterly deny. I say it is all very well for him to assume that the Church of Rome is the Catholic Church, and to talk of its being invested from on high with the characteristics and the features of the Church of Christ. The whole question between us is, whether the Church of Rome be **THE TRUE CHURCH** or not. I maintain that she is not the true church, but a corrupt and apostate branch of the Church of Christ, broken off for her apostasy. The whole of the *onus probandi* rests with my learned antagonist. He must show that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ.

He proceeded next in the words of all his speeches, to prove and declare that I am a Calvinist: this

is his usual resource when he has nothing else. Now, I have nothing to do but deny, as I have done, all subordination to or identity with Calvin. The BIBLE is my rule of faith, and not Calvin's Institutes. If the latter were in flames before you, my rule is intact.

He then said I intended in my former address to convey the impression that all sins are *equal*. I never made the assertion. I want solid argument. This is mere gratuitous aspersion, not logic. One sin is more heinous than another, and unquestionably shall receive, as it merits, its degrees of punishment in the world to come. I hold distinctions of guilt, and degrees in sins, but that the least and the greatest are pardonable through faith in Christ. My opponent then indulged in a sentimental excursion of a curious kind—that of a great sinner, brought to the close of life, who, after having perpetrated many crimes, put faith in Christ, and dies: Is he to be admitted, asked this logician, to the same share of glory as the man who had led a spotless life? Now, my reply is short and simple. At the *eleventh* hour there is mercy in Christ for sinners: whensoever the guiltiest shall go to God in Christ for mercy, imploring pardon and acceptance through his merits, and heaven's glory through his blood, that sinner shall be justified, sanctified, and glorified. "Such," says the apostle, "were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified." In heaven are degrees of glory: it is written, "As one star differs from another star in glory," so shall one saint differ from another in the amount of his happiness and in the brilliancy of his glories. But the least and loftiest of the saved will reflect, not their own, but the glories

of Christ. Surely there are degrees of sin, and as surely are there, in the regions of the lost, degrees of punishment. No sound theologian will deny that there are degrees of punishment in hell, and degrees of glory in heaven; but as little will any enlightened mind dispute the other proposition I have reiterated, namely, that such is sin's malignity, that he who breaks the law in one *particular* is *guilty of all*; that "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the law to do them;" that "the wages of sin," *venial*, or *mortal*—the wages of sin, in the aggregate, "is *death*." In fact, the word "*venial*" does not occur in the Bible; and the distinction of sins into venial and mortal by the Church of Rome is not only utterly absurd, but pregnant with immorality and crime.

My antagonist next alluded to my proofs, drawn from Roman Catholic historians, of the corruptions of the priests, and popes, and bishops during the tenth and succeeding centuries; and with reluctance admitted (what he dare not well deny) that they were of the stamp and character Cardinal Baronius declared them to be. I thought he would treat Baronius as he had treated Dupin, and the whole host of Romish doctors—casting them overboard, along with all that resisted his most logical march. But he admitted very ingenuously that there *were* gross corruptions; and urged in reply, and by way of retaliation, "Had not we corruptions in the Protestant Church?" I admit that there have been. But mark the difference! We have no oral traditions coming through Protestants, depending on the *purity* of the *channels* through which they are transmitted; whereas my opponent and his church have been

dependent on popes and bishops and priests knee-deep in corruption, for the truth, the genuineness, and authenticity of vital and essential doctrines. There might be the grossest corruption in the priests and ministers of the Protestant Church, but our RULE OF FAITH would remain notwithstanding untouched and "undefiled," unshorn of one beam of its imperishable brilliancy, uncontaminated in one paragraph of its enduring purity. But if in the Church of Rome there have been centuries of intense moral night, and of corruption—if wickedness abounded upon all sides, and pre-eminently covered the priests, the bishops, and popes of the Church of Rome, then, mark you! as they were the depositaries of half the Rule of Faith, of the mysteries and traditions of the Roman Church, as they were the only channels through which a part of the Rule of Faith of the Roman Catholic Church flowed, to the Council of Trent, that reservoir of corruption, *the presumption*, nay, *the certainty* is, that these traditions caught a poisonous taint from the filthy and unholy channels through which they passed, and that that *part* of the Rule of Faith of my learned antagonist may and must have been as corrupted and polluted as the channels through which that portion of the Rule of Faith was transmitted. Cardinal Baronius speaks of the bishops and priests in terms of the most awful description. He states, for instance, there "were false pontiffs;" and, if so, they must have handed down false traditions; that courtizans were the consecrators of popes; that the "canons were closed," "ancient traditions proscribed," and "the usages of former days wholly extinct." In such a sink of reprobates as the popedom then was,

by a cardinal's admission, must not those twists, and turns, and colourings have been given to ancient traditions, which are the staple of Popery?

Baronius again thus speaks of a pope, a depositary of traditions, a fount of infallibility:—"Let us see what remedy they further had recourse to to extinguish THIS THREE-HEADED BEAST WHO HAD ISSUED FROM THE GATES OF HELL."—(This cardinal is worse than Dupin, and ought to be excommunicated by Mr. French.)—"A remedy was devised precisely similar to that which the poets feigned in destroying the fabulous Cerberus, namely, the filling of his jaws with a pitchy mouthful, by giving them something to eat, so that he should altogether leave off barking. But let us see who it was that prepared that remedy which the unhappiness of the times demanded. Otho faithfully relates it as follows: A certain pious priest, named Gratian, approached the above-mentioned men, and prevailed upon them by money; the revenues of England being made over to Benedict because he appeared to be of chief authority. On this account the citizens elected the aforesaid priest for their pope, and called him Gregory the Sixth."—*Baronii An. Eccles. anno Christi* 1044, t. xi.

Also Genebrard's *Chronicles*, (book iv. A.D. 1079, Paris edit. 1585,) have these words:—"How deplorable the condition of the church was then, and almost resembling our own, we may learn from Siegebert, Vincentius, and Antonius. There were great contests between the emperor and the pope. The priests were of most depraved morals, and, on that account, both themselves and the sacred things were despised by the people."

Three contending popes were

censured by the Council of Pisa as "notorious heretics," sess. 15, A.D. 1409.

This, at all events, is unsparing censure on the channels through which the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith must come. I have other extracts to adduce in abundance, did time permit me, exhibiting the awful corruption and gross heresies of the great mass of the priests and popes of the Church of Rome of centuries bygone. My learned antagonist's assertions have placed me in this position. I now ask, Is it consonant to fact or experience, or to our knowledge of human nature, that *unwritten* traditions, passing through channels the most tainted, should come out, if they thus entered, truths the most pure? It is impossible that in bosoms the most polluted, traditions, unfixed by writing, were handed down uncontaminated and unperverted. I say, that, from all experience of our fallen race, from all the chapters of the story of our species, from every trait of our common humanity, it is not a mere presumption, but a moral certainty, that one-half of the Rule of Faith of the Church of Rome is corrupt, even as the channels through which it has flowed.

My opponent argued, in justification of wicked popes, that Caiaphas, the high-priest, predicted events which were immediately to follow in connexion with the death of Christ, and yet was not a believer. I admit it, and so did Balaam's ass. [Loud laughter, occasioned we presume by the ludicrousness of the parallel, as opposed to Mr. French's argument.]

MR. FRENCH.—[Turning to Mr. Cumming, and then to the audience.]—Do not laugh at Scripture.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I do not laugh at Scripture; I deplore the

absurdity of your arguments, and the total irrelevancy of the instance you quoted; and I demand a reply from any one, whether it has any connexion on the face of the earth with the subject? What the ass said is written, and therefore sure; but yours is unwritten. I say again, Balaam's ass prophesied; but there is no argument to be deduced from that fact in favour of the "infallibility" of the ass, or the "infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church." But mark, if Caiaphas *did* prophesy, I maintain he did not *know* that he prophesied; he was overpowered by inspiration from God; it was a divine and irresistible impulse. But surely this unbelieving high-priest is not held by my opponent to have been the first pope? Because a Pharisee prophesied by a miracle, it is not therefore true that tradition was preserved uninfected in infected priests, and through "monster-popes;" for it was not so kept among the Jews; and therefore, then as now, the priests "make void the word of God by their traditions."

Again, he says, Roman Catholics do not depend upon popes, but on councils. But oral tradition is neither pope nor council, but half the Roman rule of faith. But I refer to one of these councils, as he has sent me to one of the earliest of them—the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 438, act vi. decree 6, concerning THE FAITH. If the Church of Rome is guided by councils, she will have to clip off the half of her Creed.

"The holy synod determined that it should not be lawful for any one to set forth, write, or compose any other creed than that which was determined by the holy fathers who assembled at Nice, in the Holy Ghost; and that if any one shall

dare to compose any other creed, or adduce, or present it to those who are willing to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, either from heathenism, Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever, such persons, if bishops, shall be deprived of their episcopal office; if the clergy, of the clerical," &c.—Conc. iii. 689.

Now, mark you, the Church of Rome has taken the Nicene Creed, and added to it that of Pope Pius's twelve other articles. He says, he goes to the *councils* for his faith; well, I follow him: I go to this council of learned and Christian men; and in that council I discover that, in the face of its solemn interdiction, the Church of Rome tacks to the Nicene twelve other articles, which are, despite the prohibition of the Council, presented for repetition to every proselyte to Romanism. For which deed, every bishop of the Roman Church in England is, *ipso facto*, deposed, and every priest degraded, and on their own principles.

If I were to abjure the truth of God, and were so left to myself, and to the eclipse of my reason and the revelation of God, as to embrace the Roman Catholic faith, Mr. French knows, and the two reverend gentlemen who are with him know, that I should have to profess my faith in the terms of the creed commonly known by the name of the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, which is in defiance of the express canon of the Council of Ephesus. Either the Church of Rome is changed, or councils err.

A VOICE.—The first council.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I say, I should have to take the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, and repeat it, if I were perverted to Romanism; but the bishop or priest who would make me do so, would act in the very teeth of an infallible council.

Are councils fallible and infallible, just as Mr. French blows hot or cold? My antagonist has not admitted the infallibility of the pope, but he has professed his belief of the infallibility of a council. Do I perfectly understand you?—[Turning to Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—Yes!

REV. J. CUMMING.—[In continuation.]—Well, then, I go to the council, and the council contradicts Pope Pius the Fourth, and Pope Pius the Fourth contradicts the council. Mr. French proclaims the Council of Ephesus infallible; and the two priests now on his left violate it every time they receive a convert. Where is the vaunted *unity* of the Roman Catholic Church, when I find council against pope, and pope against council, and the priests of the nineteenth century against both? This surely is not the harmony of union; this is not the sweet and unbroken brotherhood of Jerusalem. It is rather the disorder, the darkness, the apostasy of Babel, wherein the clang and clamour, most euphonious, of a thousand discordant tongues are continually rising.

Again, to present, *en passant*, another illustration of the papal unity, and presumptive purity of their traditions. The Transalpines declare the pope to be fallible, but the Cisalpines believe that the pope is infallible—[the reverend gentleman observing signs to the contrary on Mr. French's part, immediately added,] He denies a notorious fact. Now, I ask again, Where is the *unity* of your Church? My learned friend is constantly twitting and taunting us Protestants about our disunion; but when we come to look at his Church, and analyse her proud and lofty assumptions, we find not only council against pope, and pope against council, but we

find the whole body of the priests of Italy against the whole body of the priests of France and Britain. The traditions, therefore, of France must, of course, be different from those of Italy, and *ergo*, a contradictory rule of faith.

My learned antagonist next quoted, in his wanderings, the second Psalm. Now, what on the broad earth has *that* to do with the Rule of Faith? We read in that Psalm, "The heathen shall be given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." What has that to do with the Rule of Faith? I can gather this only: that the pope is speedily to lose his despotism, and Rome her tyranny, and Christ to reign in righteousness from the rivers to the ends of the earth.

Again, he quoted Isaiah vi. 11.—"Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." But to apply these predictions to the Roman Catholic Church is a *petitio principii*, a taking for granted that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ—an assumption I can neither give into nor admit. His reference to Ezekiel is as inapposite. It is utter waste of time, and totally unworthy of a tolerable advocate, to take for granted that the prophecies descriptive of the glories of the Church refer to the Roman apostasy. This is the very question. The words he had quoted were from Ezekiel xxxvii. 27: "My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people." This prediction the prophet previously explains in the sixteenth verse of the same chapter: 'Moreover, thou Son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it,

For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions;" and thus the sacred seer shows that the prophecy relates to the restoration of the Jews, and the re-union of the severed tribes of Judah and Ephraim. Such, however, is my opponent's itching for appropriation clauses, that he tries to filch the glories of the Church of the Jews and that of the Gentiles, to deck out the apostasy of the Church of Rome.

Again, he quoted another passage: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU, and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, my friend did give you these closing paragraphs of the apostle's commission, but he forgot to put particular *emphasis* on this portion of them—"TEACHING ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I COMMAND YOU." This last office of any portion of the Church is the condition of the fulfilment of the promise, "I am with you unto the end of the world." If the Church of Rome does not teach what Christ commanded, but the opposite, Christ is not with her. But the twelve articles appended to the Nicene Creed to form the new one (Pope Pius the Fourth's) do *not* teach "whatsoever Christ commanded you." I maintain, and I have irrefragably proved, that Christ never "commanded" *purgatory*; that he never commanded the *propitiatory sacrifice of the mass*; that he never countenanced *transubstantiation*; that he never declared the doctrine of venial and mortal sin to be any part of the Christian

faith; and unless, therefore, the Church of Rome has been teaching, during centuries now merged in eternity, "all things whatsoever she is commanded" to teach, Christ *is not with her* "to the end of the world." Her whole history, on the contrary, shows before heaven and earth, she is left to herself; that over the awful accents of reprobation are uttered, "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone."

Again, he adduced as an evidence of the Roman Rule of Faith the circumstance and the successes of the missionaries of the Church of Rome in China. I shall probably be able, if we have time, next evening, to give you some illustrations of the peculiar *processes* and *distinctive* schemes which they adopted for the conversion of the Chinese. That the Roman Catholic missionaries and Jesuits have gone into the world preaching and teaching subjection to their creed, is a fact we do not deny. But this only proves them to be more palpably priests of the apocalyptic apostasy; for the word of God has said respecting the apostasy of Babylon, "*All nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.*" And again, "By her sorceries were all nations deceived, and in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." It is one of the features attached to the Roman Catholic Church by the pen and in the page of inspiration, that she should thus send her priests as the locusts of Egypt, not the lights of the world, to darken all the nations of the earth.

Again: he asked, while the Romish missionaries in past ages, and the Jesuits, and the followers of the different orders, were among the Chinese, and the Siamese, and Japanese, he says, "Where were the

Baptists, and Independents, and Wesleyans, and Calvinists? where were the Church of Scotland and Church of England people, and all the sections of the Protestants, during these periods of the missionary exploits of the Jesuits, and others before them? I will tell you *where* they were: they were often hiding like outcasts in the caves of the earth from the tortures of the Inquisition, and the yet unextinguished fires of Dominic; they had to escape from the faggot and the furnace, and hide themselves in the mountains and dens of the earth; to wander in sheepskins and goatskins; seeking refuge from the fires persecution was kindling, and the engines of torture preparing for their death. My answer to my opponent's question is not to the credit of his Church, when he asks where my forefathers and your forefathers all were during the middle ages? I reply, We were where Elijah and the seven thousand were,—adoring God in secret and in silence, whilst the awful Western Apostasy spread itself from sea to sea, and over vast continents of space, and was planting its influences, like some evil genius, amid the fairest and most fruitful isles of the ocean. My learned antagonist must never forget the decretals of Pope Gregory, the Inquisition, and the fourth Council of the Lateran; the persecution to which the Waldenses and the Piedmontese were devoted. The witnesses of Christ preached, and prayed, and testified, while Rome held her dread carnival of blood; and Protestants by thousands were obliged to conceal themselves in the tents of Mesek and the tabernacles of Kedar, lest the minister should speedily be the martyr; lest his wife should be left a widow, and his children weeping orphans.

If this be the fact, the question is easily answered. As to our Protestant faith, it was, and is, where it ever has been—in God's word, and in the saints' hearts. And now that the superincumbent pressure has been withdrawn; now that the fear and terror of extermination is at an end; now that my antagonist, careless of preserving unanimity, has abjured all the persecuting principles of his Church, and, nobly for himself, cast them into the depths of the sea, our missionary and expansive zeal and energies have burst forth in every quarter of the globe; and such is our united missionary zeal, that we have appeared in this assembly, no man daring to make us afraid, ready to give a reason at any time, and before any person, for "the faith that is in us."

The next extraordinary and irrelevant statement of my learned antagonist was, that the conversation of Englishmen on the continent of Europe was beyond all parallel obscene, disgraceful, and improper. He *saw*, then, I presume, and *heard* it. But is my opponent's limited experience to warrant his sweeping assertion? I am sorry for it if his companions were of that stamp. They were not PROTESTANTS, either in heart or in practice. They degraded the name of Englishman, which, on the continent, is synonymous with Protestant. But we do not hold our Rule of Faith to be tainted or overthrown by the vicious conduct and corrupt speeches of its professors. This is the difference. The traditions of the Church of Rome must be, and are, more or less affected by the channels they have come through, because dependent on them.

Again, he stated, we were converted to Christianity by St. Gregory. Now, let me say, Gregory did not subscribe to the Creed of

Pope Pius the Fourth, and the Romanism of the Council of Trent. On the contrary, he was a total stranger to many of the tenets inflicted on the Roman Church during the fifteenth century. In the next place, St. Gregory rejected the books of Maccabees, declared them not to be canonical; while his pontifical successor declares that they are canonical. Here again is unity! In the next place, Gregory declared the fact (and I wish you particularly to remember this) that he who should *assume the title of universal bishop (sacerdotem universalem) should be the forerunner of Antichrist*. Then it follows that, if he declared it, all the popes who succeeded him, according to him, were the forerunners of *Antichrist*; for he states most plainly that "whoever should claim the title of universal bishop was the forerunner of Antichrist." And, therefore, if Gregory is to have the credit of having converted England to the faith, let us learn at the same time that Gregory, a Roman Catholic, abjured the Books of Maccabees, and detected many doctrinal points, for the abjuration of which Mr. French would be cut off from the Roman Catholic communion, and placed under the ban and anathema of the Council of Trent.

His next statement is, that the Roman Catholic missionaries had converted many; and from *that fact*, he presumes that all the characteristics of the Church of Christ belong to the Roman Catholic church! I reply to this, Mahomet, the Arabian impostor, "the false prophet," converted thousands and thousands more; but I would not infer from that that he belonged to the true church, or that the gross superstitions he taught were the truths of the Gospel, or that the Koran is the Bible, and the mosque

of St. Omar the cathedral of St. Paul. Robert Owen has several thousand wretched adherents, who are proselyted to his abominable notions, in London; but *non constat* that he is a Christian, and Socialism divine. If mere success in proselytism is to be held as a test of true Christianity, many will be found to lay claim and right to that sacred name, who in the sight of God are destitute alike of its principles and practices altogether. But let him know that the most successful proselytism, to the amount even of the world, is no proof of truth; multitudes are not always the criterion of truth, nor success the criterion of rectitude. Let him know, that at one moment in the history of the Church of Christ, a *whole nation* had bowed the knee unto Baal, and had been proselyted to his worship; and Elijah, the prophet of the Lord, was obliged to cry, "And *I* only am left alone." I protest that if the whole of this assembly, with the exception of one, were to stand up and proclaim in some moment of unhappy delusion, "Roman Catholicism is right;" and if some poor orphan child were to stand up, and say, "PROTESTANTISM is right," that orphan would be right, and the whole assembly would be wrong. Truth is not contingent on multitudes. Truth is equally truth when the hosannas of myriads are lifted in her praise, as well as when she lies hid in the dens and caverns of the earth, or is led bound hand and foot by the familiar to the fire that has been lighted in the inclosures of the Inquisition. Truth is not dependent upon multitudes. Numbers cannot add to her glory and her triumphs, much less injure or depreciate her character. No, my friends, we must appeal "TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY." Whatever can be

proved by *that* is truth; whatever is disproved by it, though all the world profess it, must be error.

I had intended to enter on a wide field of direct disproof of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, and in defence of the Protestant Rule of Faith; but I have taken up too much time, I must say, in following after the wild and irrelevant digressions of my learned antagonist. I therefore have left myself no spare time. But I would yet observe that he must not run away. *No reply has been given to my opening statement.* That he has left totally untouched, remember. You will recollect that I have not shrunk, even at the risk of loss of time, from following out the whole of his most extravagant and utterly inapplicable statements, and replying to them *seriatim et verbatim*, one by one, and showing that his sense and nonsense are alike. Let me, therefore, draw my remarks to a conclusion, by calling your attention for a moment to the *estimate which the word of God forms of the value and importance of the traditions of men*—those traditions which constitute half of the Roman Rule of Faith. I quote, for this purpose, Matt. xv. 1, 2: “Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the *traditions* of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.” Exactly, you observe, the question which the Church of Rome puts to us Protestants: “Why do ye, adhering to the written word, transgress the traditions of the priests? Why have ye rejected the twelve articles of Pope Pius the Fourth, added to the Nicene Creed? Why have ye abandoned the books of Maccabees, and the canons of the Council of Trent?” We reply, as the Son of God replied, (verse 3,)

“Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?” And again, in the ninth verse, our Lord says: “But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the *commandments of men*.” They are here commanded to worship God alone on Scripture principles; receiving nothing that is based upon tradition alone, having nothing to do with “the commandments of men,” which are declared here to stamp all raised upon them as “in vain.”

Again, (Mark vii. 5, 6, 8,) — “Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered, and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” Again, verse 13 of the same chapter, “Making the word of God of *none effect through your traditions*.” precisely the Roman Catholic exploits. Again, (1 Peter i. 18, 19)—“Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, *from your vain conversation received by tradition* from your fathers”—received, you observe, by tradition from your fathers. Again, (2 Thess. ii.)—“Now we beseech, &c. that ye be not shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither *by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us*, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, *and that man of sin* be revealed, the son of perdition.” Now, mark! all these passages imply that tradition is

uncertain and deceiving, an *ignis fatuus* that leads men astray from heaven to earth, and from God to fallen man; and that we are at once to abandon the absurdities of tradition, that have been received from "the elders," and to adhere only to the WORD OF GOD.

Let me draw your attention to the language of the apostle Paul, in describing the word of God as opposed to the traditions of men: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is *profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*"—

Why? (verse 17)—"That the *man of God may be perfect*, thoroughly furnished to every good work." Now, observe the tradition-exterminating statement of the word of God. Whilst it attaches all that is *uncertain*, all that is erroneous, dangerous, and destructive, all that naturally leads men astray, to "*tradition*," it attaches certainty, salvation and perfection to the written word; it pronounces by the pen of the same inspired writer, that the word of God is given by inspiration, and is *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction," and so on. Why?—"That the man of God may be *perfect*." We have perfection by the written word; why unwarrantably and unnecessarily thrust tradition on us? Can you wish for anything more? Can you wish more complete investiture with title to glory, honour, and immortality, more complete preparedness for heaven, through any other instrumentality? Again (Psalm xix. 7)—"The law of the Lord is *perfect*, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is *sure*, making wise the simple." The law of the Lord, you observe, is *perfect*; this makes it *sufficient*, "*converting the soul*:" there is *conversion* attributed to its instrumentality;—"the testimony

of the Lord is *sure*, making wise the simple;" there is the enlightening of the understanding attributed to it. Again, our Lord says (John iii. 30)—"*Search the Scriptures*, for they are they which testify of me." The passage, as rendered by the Church of Rome, is scarcely a deviation. "*Ye search the Scriptures*, for they are they which testify of me." Now the difference is nothing; because, if I take the translation of the Church of Rome, it implies that they (the Jews) were in the habit of searching the Scriptures, (which point I contend for,) and that our Lord approved of this; or, if I take our translation, it implies that it is our duty to search the Scriptures; "for in them," observe, *not in tradition* of any kind, not in the unwritten word interpreted by the Church, but in the *Scriptures*, "*ye have eternal life.*" Again, (John xx. 31)—"But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." Now, observe, the apostle again states the sufficiency of Scripture in these words. He says that such is the clearness and fulness of the Gospel of John, that, by reading that alone, the believer can be led to a knowledge of Christ, and to the possession of eternal life. Now, mark you, if the perusal of one solitary Gospel can lead to the attainment of eternal life, *a fortiori* it must necessarily follow, the whole Bible must be abundantly sufficient to lead the sinner, anxiously reading, but ignorant of the knowledge of eternal life, to its enjoyment. And again, we find it stated that not only have we instruction, conversion, sanctification, holiness, perfection, and everlasting life through the Scriptures, but that also we have

joy, comfort, and peace, through the perusal of the word of God. 1 John i. 3 :—" And truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full. These things have I said unto you that in me ye might have peace." If, then, I desire the safety of believers, the sanctity of saints, the peace of time, or the joys of eternity; if I desire aught that can illuminate my mind, quicken my soul, and exhilarate with joy unutterable and full of glory my spirit that thirsts for God, the living God, I find that the Bible declares, in terms that admit neither of misconstruction nor misinterpretation, and in terms which ought with honest minds to settle this controversy, that by its instrumentality alone ye shall have all in one word, Eternal Life. The BIBLE! — Its very position proclaims our duty to read it. Suppose a letter were addressed to a son in a far distant land by his anxious father resident in this country, what would that son understand by such a letter? He would at once understand by it that it was a communication of his father's sentiments, and feelings, and anxieties, to him; and that it was his immediate duty as well as privilege to peruse the letter, that by it he might learn and understand all the feelings and desires his parent cherished concerning him. *This book* is a letter on a larger scale, sent down from the archives of heaven by God our gracious Father, beaming with the majesty of truth and paternal love. It is addressed, not to priests, nor to popes, nor to bishops, as such, but it is addressed to "*all* the faithful who are in Christ, to Greek also, and barbarian, Jews, and Gentiles, saints and sinners," and every one,

without distinction of rank, of riches, possession, or of character. Every eye is called upon to read it, and every ear to hear, and every heart to feel, and all flesh to search, that all may find everlasting life. Let not priests plunder you, my Roman Catholic brethren, of the boon of the Eternal.

It is your Bible: read it; reflect on it. If you say that the Scriptures are so obscure you cannot understand them, I will be prepared to bring text after text, and passage after passage, declaring that the Scriptures may be understood in every important point, and especially by the aid and assistance of the Holy Spirit directing our private judgment, exercised on it as the Rule of Faith; and much more easily a thousand times than by the aid of all the rules and infallibilities of the world.

I am prepared to bring Scriptures, not assertions, forward to show that, aided by the Holy Spirit, you can understand the Scriptures. I will also give instances that show how this understanding of Scripture leads to eternal life. One instance let me prefer at this moment. When Paul came to preach to the Bereans, they did not take his assertions alone, his *ipse dixit*; but, holding even the inspiration and infallibility of the Old Testament, they brought an apostle's preaching to the test of the word of God; and if they brought an apostle's teaching to the Old Testament, much more should we bring priests' teaching to the New Testament. "They searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so; and, therefore, many of them believed." — Acts xvii. 11. And therefore I maintain that it is your duty also when your priests preach to you—

[The chairman, J. KENDAL, Esq.

here announced the expiration of the hour, and the rev. gentleman closed abruptly.

[The rev. gentleman had scarcely seated himself, when Mr. French rose immediately, and followed out the rev. gentleman's concluding arguments, as follows:]

MR. FRENCH.—Yes, my friends, “they *searched* the Scriptures,” as the apostle commanded them. But remark, my friends, it was *before the New Testament* was written, that he is telling the Jews to search the Scriptures, in order to be persuaded that Christ Jesus was the true Redeemer; and that is the sole meaning of the text just alluded to with so much emphasis by my learned friend. My learned friend has frequently complained before, and he has now reiterated the complaint—the stale complaint—in mere and servile imitation of my just and undeniable charge against him, that I am a very wild and untameable animal in the fields of reasoning and logic—[laughter;]—in one word, that he cannot tame me; that he cannot domesticate me to his mode of thinking, and so make me fall into the snares he has so ingeniously laid for me—[laughter]—and I own I am wild enough to claim my own prerogative of chalking out a way for myself, without condemning myself to give set answers to every one of his deviations, and his host of irrelevant remarks. [*Strong commotion in a part of the meeting.*]

[JOHN KENDAL, Esq. rose on behalf of Mr. French to claim silence and attention.]

A VOICE [in strong Hibernian accent, endeavouring to explain the cause of this sudden movement, said,] “Oh, it is a lot of *bigots* going away.”—[*A cry of “Turn him out;” and “Order.”*]

[The meeting having assumed a

tranquil posture of attention, the learned gentleman again rose, and said—]

And now, my friends, we are arrived at a period of our labours where it would be proper for me to terminate the whole dispute in one moment; yes, my friends, by calling upon my rev. antagonist to bring the tenets of his creed to be tried by his own touchstone, namely, the Bible. Should he fail, as fail he must, in his application to that test, what need, let me ask, of protracting the discussion one moment longer? Come, then, I exclaim, my reverend antagonist [looking pointedly at Mr. Cumming], come, my honoured friend, thou who boastest that the Bible is *thy rule of faith*, tell me by what licence given to thee in that Bible art thou empowered to overstep its most solemn laws; to set at nought its most peremptory enactments? Show me one clear text in that Bible that authorizes, enjoins, or even permits you to *keep the Sabbath on a Sunday*.

Rev. Mr. CUMMING.—Hear, hear!

MR. FRENCH.—(*In continuation.*)

You call upon *us* for a text if we talk of Extreme Unction, which has been practised from time immemorial in the Catholic Church: we Catholics point out to you a text of the most luminously descriptive nature, one that is accurate to the very letter, to its every syllable, when squared by the practice of our Church at the present day; namely, St. James v. 14, 15:—“Is any sick among you?—Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him.”

Well then, my Bible-regulated theologian, though this does not satisfy *you* to prove the doctrine of Extreme Unction, show me, I say, one of half its energy and clearness to sanction you in keeping the Sabbath on the Sunday, and I shall be perfectly satisfied that you are most fixed and unswerving from your golden rule, instead of denouncing, as I now do, your departure from the Saturday as an act of impious daring on your part, totally unwarranted by any one syllable to be found either in the Old or New Testament. The day of the Sabbath was solemnly appointed by the promulgation of the Lord God Jehovah; the day was specifically numbered; there is a malediction of the most tremendous nature in the Sacred Book upon the heads of those who should dare to keep it at unappointed time; and yet ye do it without a single shadow of a text to justify the deed. If, with us, my friends, ye celebrate the Sunday in adherence to Catholic *tradition*, ye act according to the apostolical line, and ye are not open to delusion; but, if ye affect to scorn tradition, I pin you to the Bible, and you must this day unfold its pages, and prove most clearly and systematically from them that ye are not at variance with its precepts by keeping the Sabbath on the Sunday. But no, my friends, the Bible stares you in the face: you are acting in contravention to your leading, your fundamental rule.

Again, my friends, I ask of my antagonist, who seems to keep the Bible in his hands this day but with a slippery hold, where, in what book is to be found one word relative to the baptism of infants?—(Acts viii. 37.)—"If thou believest with all thine heart," says Scripture, "thou mayest" (be baptized.) What was the answer? "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Now,

I ask, unless tradition come to the rescue of my learned friend, by what refining ingenuity will he call upon the Bible to protect him in baptizing infants, that cannot give the answer, that cannot exclaim, "*I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?*" See ye not, my friends, that my antagonist in argument lies prostrate at my feet? See ye not that he is, in practice, in a state of actual hostility with the very book which he holds up as the fountain of all his tenets, as the rule of all his actions?

It is quite a ludicrous thing, say the Anabaptists, to pour water on an unperceiving infant, when you are not so justified by the Bible. But we CATHOLICS, when we follow the ever-sounding voice of tradition, we understand how it is. We know very well that God never meant to instruct and convert barbarian nations to Christianity by the Bible. You tell me that I am "wandering from the laws of logic;" that I do not adhere punctiliously to the subject. I say I adhere perfectly to the question. My object in the beginning was to prove that the Roman Catholics converted all nations unto God, and *that* without putting the Bible into their hands—converted those who could neither read nor write; for the art of printing was only invented in the fourteenth century. The Bible *alone* could not convert nations. Yes; the ROMAN CATHOLICS were the grand converters of nations; the men who by their chaste, exemplary, and unsullied lives, showing how they could trample upon pleasure and despise all danger in the cause of Christ Jesus, and striking the untutored barbarian with a reverential awe which all the parsons in England, with all their innumerable Bibles, landing on some foreign shore in the present age, would never be able to inspire. [Laughter.]

No; it is the living, breathing, legible impress of true sanctity on the very features of our CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES, that at once struck the barbarians with awe and veneration. It was their acting up to the Bible, with souls deeply impregnated with all the fervour, all the unction of piety, and not by idly canting about its wondrous efficacy, that they impressed conviction on our barbarous ancestors. They (our ancestors) saw a set of men, holy and devout, spurning away the common, ay, even the lawful pleasures of life, and disdaining its allurements, in order that they might serve immaculately at the altar of their God; and they said to one another, in a natural outbreak of wonder, Surely these are more like *angels* than like men! [Sensation.] See them, they exclaimed, with their crucifixes in their hands, moving on with unwearied step over mountains and valleys! How little they subsist upon in their progress! See their contempt for earthly enjoyment and pleasure; and see them at another time prostrate at their holiest altars, wrapped up in silent contemplation, or sounding forth amidst surrounding multitudes the Gospel of their Lord and Master Jesus Christ!

Such, my friends, were the glorious, the heavenly-minded converters of nations; and not your dry, musing, moralizing parsons in the nineteenth-century pulpits.—[Renewed sensation.] Gentlemen, though I shall not exactly follow in the path pointed out by my ingenious and subtle friend, I will certainly, before I pursue the connected line of argument I intended to adhere to this evening, make one observation upon the authoritative interpretation given by my “incorruptible” friend, to the abominable and gross corruptions of his English version of the Bible. And, whenever he has

the hardihood, time after time, to rise up and say one word in extenuation of its enormous guilt, these two verses will stare him *point blank* in the face. I have been a translator myself, and know how to make allowances for the slumberings, and slips, and inadvertences of a translator; but I cannot pardon any one who has the least pretensions to initiation in Latin and Greek, that shall maintain it to be in analogy to grammatical rule, to translate *should* for *shall*, to give the *conditional* in translation instead of the *future*. I have had the honour of instructing in those languages some of the brightest scholars at Oxford and Cambridge, and never yet have I met with one who, in writing, could be guilty of such a solecism. I want to know, then, on what extraordinary principle of translating, Protestant interpreters have given us this *should* for *shall*? Let me have a direct answer from my learned opponent; no quibbling about it; no sophistry; no “special pleading.” Let it be made as clear and as accessible to the understandings of “*poor benighted Roman Catholics*” in this room, as you can [to Mr. Cumming] possibly do, in your unlimited kindness and condescension. Again, as to the text, “desperately wicked,” I certainly must tell my learned friend that it is indeed a *softener*—[laughter]—a softener of the meaning of the passage—truly, a highly softened phrase, a finely-rasped and mollified expression, is it not? There is not a word of it in the original. I appeal to a man (Mr. Lyons) who knows Hebrew as well as I do English. He says there is no room for it. I will give it you *verbatim*:

“The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and inscrutable, (or anxious.) Who shall know it?”

That is the word; but to say, “desperately wicked!—

Rev. J. CUMMING—[In a soft tone, unheard by Mr. French].—Read it again.

Mr. FRENCH.—[In continuation.] But, my friends, the reason *why* they *put it* in was this: At the beginning of the Reformation, Luther maintained, and Calvin after him, that the very best of human actions were mortal sins—that there were no works of merit—that all were defiled with mortal sins; and they accordingly wanted to foist in this depravation of the sacred text to bear out the doctrine, and thus committed this imposition on the British public. Just as Luther did when he made up his mind to trample under foot the solemn vow he had made to God, and marry, and took a woman who had sworn to preserve inviolable chastity; and, not content with that, he sits down to vitiate that text in the Bible where it says, “If they do not contain, let them marry.” If they do not contain—that is, if they are in the habit of committing sin. But, what does Luther do in one of his metamorphosing moods? Why, the very same as the English translation of the Bible—the notoriously, and proverbially, and abominably false English translation of the Bible: “If they *cannot* contain, let them marry.” *These* are the abominations I complain of, in this their so much vaunted book of consummate excellence, the *parliamentary* Bible with the crown upon its head! But to pursue my train of argument—although, in my extemporizing style, my sentences may not flow forth quite so fluently and elegantly as those which pour forth ever smoothly and fantastically from my friend’s oratorical aqueduct. [Laughter.] My reverend friend indulged you with long and *jeune* readings from Baronius. Now, in my own connected way, before I proceed further, I will

give him *his own immortal Dean Milner*, by way of preface and explanation to my subject matter, to corroborate that train of argument. For I really will not be accused with such impunity, of wandering, as my learned friend does in such elevated strains of eloquence, into the region of rhetoric. My argument, which I place like a standard in the forefront of this dispute, is, that the CATHOLICS converted all nations to Christianity, and that they did it by following *tradition*. I ask you, therefore, my respected friends, Who is there in this assembly, maturely considering all I have already laid before them; clearly considering the prophecy of our Lord, declaring *that all the Gentiles were to be converted*, and the grand commission which Christ gave to his disciples to go and convert them—who is there, I say, looking at the facts and records thus laid before you, can entertain the shadow of a doubt that the *Catholic religion* is the *real* religion of primitive Christianity? Tell me, O my friends, do we not see in her sublime march through every land, in her onward, unwearied journey through the track of ages, before the name of a Protestant was heard of—do we not recognise in this her glorious career the accomplishment of the divine promise of God, that all nations were to be converted through her instrumentality? Do not the most uncontested records of history evidence the fact beyond all controversy?

Does not even your own Protestant ecclesiastical historian, the Rev. Joseph Milner, whom I am about to quote to you—ay, even to the surfeit of my reverend antagonist—historically prove that all nations which have been converted from Paganism or Judaism to Christ Jesus for so many centuries past, were converted to the Catholic faith

and incorporated in that Roman Church?—against which ye unanimously protest as being sunk in damnable idolatry and damnable superstition; but which I this day undauntedly proclaim in the presence of you all to be the genuine religion of the blessed, the lovely, the adorable, the immortal Jesus. True, they went about on this their sublime errand, without either wives or children. But what then, my friend? Listen to your own favourite historian, Joseph Milner, page 28, in his “History of the Church of Christ,” referring to Paul’s Epistles:—

“In answer to their queries,” says he, “Paul recommends celibacy as preferable to matrimony, where a man can practise it; and that I think, from general reasons, as more favourable to holiness.” And a little lower on the same page, he says, “I should not wonder if some persons should startle at what I have mentioned as the sentiments of St. Paul, *though it be impossible for any unprejudiced person to understand him otherwise.*”

How, then, again I exclaim, is it possible that that religion, thus planted in every country by men of the most unquestionable holiness, should be false, and impious, and blasphemous, as my reverend friend would say, in *his soft and truly Christian phraseology*, that could effect such a wonderful, such a supernatural mutation in the hearts of barbarian nations? Is it possible that Divine Providence should have permitted all those nations to be deceived for such a length of years?—especially after they had forsaken their idolatry, so earnestly embraced the Gospel, and united themselves to what they deemed to be the Church of Christ; no Church of England, no Lutherans, no Calvinists, no Anabaptists, no Quakers,

no Irvingites, having as yet been born or heard of, to cant about the diffusion of their Bibles, and to plan the conversion of nations by outpouring whole cargoes of them in silent stealth upon every distant shore. Depend upon it, my friends, the more ye ransack ancient annals, the more will ye be convinced that these miraculous achievements were performed by the Catholic Church alone.

Yes, ye will behold so many remote nations taking refuge in her sacred bosom; so many potent kingdoms forsaking their idolatry; abandoning all impurity of life; rejecting their multitudes of wives; forgetting their barbarous and savage manners; banishing all their former unrestrained licentiousness of morals, to become chaste, and meek, and tractable; in one word, bending down with the docility of infants under the sweet yoke of Christ Jesus, and voluntarily trampling under foot their former highmindedness and pride; being smitten to their very souls with the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom: to sum up all, becoming estranged from the love of terrestrial things, in order to become wholly absorbed and inflamed with love of the celestial. Believe me, my friends, such wondrous works were not wrought by the agency of men who bore the least similitude to the Protestant parson!

Believe me, too, it is most unlikely that God Almighty would have plunged so many nations, just emerging as they were from the lustrations of sanguinary Druidism, into the depth of other abominable errors, and into the pollution of a new idolatry; and least of all is it likely in the ways of Providence, that he should have permitted all this silently to take place by the instrumentality of men holy, just,

and pure—oh yes, men renowned in their generation for unsullied sanctity of life, and, according to the confession even of your Protestant Milner himself, not improbably endued with the gift of miracles!

May it not, let me ask you, my Protestant friends, be said with justice, concerning the monks of the sixth century, who converted your barbarous ancestors, what Protestant Milner says of the monks of the fourth, namely, that they were "*the flower of the flock of Christ?*" And, my friends, if they were thus incontestably the flower of the flock of Christ, is it to be deemed nauseating tautology on my part, if I cry out again and again to my Scotch Calvinistic antagonist, Where, in what den, in what cavern were thy ancestors lurking, thou *lily of Sharon*, when *the flower of the flock of Christ*, the Catholic monks, were going about from nation to nation, and to thine amongst others, in order to rescue its miserable inhabitants from the pollutions of idolatry?

Now, gentlemen, I have proved to you from the Protestant Milner, and from Catholic historians of all nations, that Europeans were converted by CATHOLICS, and Catholics alone. When I call on my learned friend to tell me where the renowned followers of Luther's and Calvin's tenets were at that period—in what page of history are their deeds attested, is their piety recorded—my learned friend tells us, forsooth, that they were lurking "in the dens and caverns of the earth" for fear of the Inquisition! What! so many centuries before Dominic—before the Inquisition was heard of?—even supposing Dominic was the father of the Inquisition, which is quite an erroneous statement! But again I ask, Where were they before this? Where were

they—in sight, or within the reach of hearsay? I mean, Where were men to be found, professing the particular tenets professed by Protestants of the present day? If they were "*in caves*," go verify *those caves* by historic testimony, I say, and I will become a Protestant—ay, even the *æruugo mera*, the very seum of Protestantism, a Calvinist! But the truth is, they cannot show where they were; they cannot. My reverend friend could not, even with all his ingenuity, all the address, the artifice, all the inventive versatility of his genius, devise a plausible tale that might give to an imaginary spot the appearance of reality.

And now, my friends, as my learned antagonist is most evidently nonplused—as Calvinism, or the *lily of Sharon*, as I call it, is not able to tell where *it was washing its sweetness in the dews of the earth*—[laughter]—when the flower of the flock of Christ, the monk Augustine and his lowly followers, were evangelizing this country, let us turn for fresh matter of wonder and astonishment once more to the pages of the said Protestant historian, Milner. Speaking of Irenæus, who flourished in year of our Lord 177, he thus writes:—

"He makes a strong use of the argument of tradition in support of the apostolical doctrine against the novel heresies. His acquaintance with primitive Christians justified him in pressing this argument.

"If there were any doubt concerning the least article, ought we not to have recourse to the most ancient churches where the apostles lived? What if the apostles had left us no writings whatever? ought we not to follow the tradition which they left with those to whom they committed the care of the churches? It is what several barbarous nations

do who believe in Jesus without paper or ink; having the doctrine of salvation written on their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and faithfully *keeping up to ancient tradition* concerning one God the Creator and his Son Jesus Christ. Those who have received this faith without Scripture are barbarians as to their manner of speaking, compared with us; but, *as to their sentiments and behaviour, they are very wise and very acceptable to God*; and they persevere in the practice of justice and charity. And if any one should preach to them in their language what the heretics have invented, they would immediately *stop their ears and flee far off, and would not even hear those blasphemies.*"

Here, my friends, you see most clearly the apostolic mode by which Christianity was first planted in this country.

But, again, let my attentive but undelighted antagonist listen to another sweet extract from Protestant Milner! Speaking of the illustrious Cyprian, who flourished in the year of our Lord 248, Milner says, "The African bishop was ever studious of preserving *an intimate connexion with the Roman Church.*" Is it not matter of some wonder, my friends, that he did not say instead, of preserving an intimate connexion with the *Scotch kirk*? But, oh no; this could not be; I quite forgot: it was singing, or rather whining, its psalms in dens and caverns, *for fear of the Inquisition*! Cyprian could not find it out.—[Laughter.]

Again, Protestant Milner, p. 127, makes Cyprian thus write:—

"The Roman clergy condole affectionately with Cyprian:— 'Our sorrow,' say they, 'is doubled, because you have no rest from these pressing difficulties of the perse-

cution; and because the immoderate petulance of the lapsed has proceeded to the height of arrogance. But though these things have grievously afflicted our spirits, yet your firmness and evangelical strictness of discipline have moderated the load of vexation. You have both restrained the wickedness of certain persons; and also, by exhorting them to repentance, have shown them the wholesome way to salvation. We are astonished that they should proceed to such lengths, in a time so mournful, so unseasonable as the present—that they should not so much as *ASK for re-communication with the church.*'"

"And in truth, the whole conduct of the Roman clergy, at this season, reflects the highest honour on their wisdom and their affection; and affords the most pleasing proofs of the good state of that church at that time.

"At the same time they lay down a golden maxim, 'that we all ought to watch for the body of the whole Church, diffused through various provinces.'—It was *this unity and uniformity* of the Christian Church, which hitherto had preserved it, under God, *from the infection of heresies.* None of these were yet able to mix themselves with the 'body of Christ;' and the Church, instead of being broken into small handfuls of distinct sets of persons, all glorying in having something peculiarly excellent, and prone to despise their neighbours, as yet knew no other name than that of *Christian*; numbers and diversity of place alone prevented their assembling all together; for they were *one people.* In Italy and Africa the union at this time appears very salubrious; and the vigorous spirit and sound understanding of Cyprian was enabled to apply the solid graces of the

Roman Church as a medicine for the reformation of his own disordered flock.

"The Roman clergy, in a second letter, take notice of St. Paul's eulogium of their church in the beginning of his epistle — 'That their faith was spoken of through the whole world,' and they express their desire of treading in the steps of their Christian predecessors.

"They speak, but not from the word of the Lord: they promise to restore the lapsed, who are themselves separated from the church.

"There is one God, one Christ, one Church. Depart, I pray you, far from these men, and avoid their discourse, as a plague and pestilence. They hinder your prayers and tears by affording you false consolations. Acquiesce, I beseech you, in my counsel: I pray daily for you, and desire you to be restored to the Church by the grace of the Lord. Join your prayers and tears with mine. But, if any person shall despise repentance, and betake himself to Felicissimus and to his faction, let him know that *his re-admission into the church will be impracticable.*"

Now, I would ask my friend, is Cyprian speaking here of the Scotch kirk, or of the Catholic religion?

And now, my friends, a word as to Scotia, from the same Protestant Milner! Talking of Catholic missionaries in the sixth century, he thus writes:—

"Colomban, an Irish priest in this century, came over into the northern parts of Scotland, and laboured with much success among the Picts. The southern parts of Scotland had been evangelized long before by the instructions of Ninias, a British bishop, who had himself been instructed at Rome. Colomban lived thirty-four years after his

passage into Britain. His disciples were remarkable for the holiness and abstemiousness of their lives. Thus, while the gospel was rapidly withdrawing from the East, where it first arose, God left not himself without witness in the most distant parts of the West."

This, I confess, my friends, is not "milk and honey" for the lips of my reverend antagonist; however, such as it is, I pour it out unto him.

Come we now, my friends, to the great St. Gregory; to him who, in his heavenly solicitude for the conversion of our barbarous ancestors, sent over some of *the flower of the flock of Christ* to sound forth among them the great truths of Christianity. And let us hear the character of the said Catholic St. Gregory from Protestant Milner, and not from the pen of a cardinal:—

"He was a Roman by birth, and of a noble family. But being religiously disposed, he assumed the monastic habit, and was eminently distinguished by the progress he made in piety. It was not till after he was drawn back in a degree to a secular life by his employments in the Church, that he became thoroughly sensible what advantage he had enjoyed for his own soul from religious retirement. With tears he owned that he had had the world under his feet, while he was absorbed in heavenly contemplation; but was now bereft of comfort. 'Now,' says he, 'my mind, by reason of pastoral cares, is oppressed with the business of secular persons, and after so fair an appearance of rest, is defiled with the dust of earthly action. And suffering itself to be distracted by exterior things in condescension to many, even while it desires inward things, it returns to them, without doubt,

more faintly. I weigh, therefore, what I endure; I weigh what I have lost; and while I look at that which I have lost, my present burdens are more heavy.'

"No age ever saw a bishop more vigorous, firm, and circumspect. The immensity of ecclesiastical employment, which went through his hands, seems almost incredible.

"It is impossible for any impartial person who has attended to the spirit and conduct of Gregory, as exhibited in his pastoral memoirs, not to feel a conviction of the eminent piety, integrity, and humility of this bishop.

"Augustine having intimated, that the harvest was plenteous, but that the labourers were few, Gregory sent him more missionaries, and directed him to constitute a bishop at York, who might have other subordinate bishops; yet, in such a manner, that Augustine of Canterbury should be metropolitan of all England. Such were the rudiments of the English Church.

"On the whole, Gregory's conduct with respect to our island appears *one of the most shining efforts of Christian charity*. His missionaries, in general, acted laudably, and the real establishment of Christianity was, under God, effected by their means.

"This great prelate, worn out at length with labours and diseases, slept in Jesus in the year 604, after he had enjoyed, shall I say—or endured his bishopric thirteen years and six months. No man in any age ever gave himself up more sincerely to the service of God, and the benefit of his fellow-creatures. Power in him was a voluntary servitude, undertaken not for himself, but for all the world. Even the growth of superstition, with which he was strongly infected, while it secured to him the cheerful obe-

dience of the laity, contributed nothing to his ease or secular emolument."

So far, my friends, you have a little taste of the product of a Catholic monastery, the great but truly humble St. Gregory. It remains for you to say, whether you discover in it a spice of Scotch Calvinism! [Laughter.]

Well! let us go along with our smoothly-flowing Protestant historian, and enter the seventh century.

"I avail myself," says Protestant Milner (page 418), "of all the help which offers for the supply of materials. But I mean to extol the Church of Christ, wherever I can find her; nor does a *Roman dress*, when she appears in it, convey any prejudice to my mind."

Very good indeed, say I, Dean Milner; but what a pity is it that, in surveying that age, you could not discover the Church of Christ with a *Scotch dress* on it! *A fortiori*, you could have had no prejudice in recording its achievements! Now go on, Dean Milner; and let my reverend antagonist from the land of Scotia listen *arrectis auribus!* The words I am about to cite will most undoubtedly be to him either thistles or roses, I know not which, nor on which he most delights in feeding! [Laughter.]

"In this manner I would appreciate the characters of the Romish missionaries in England. Their disinterested labours, just views of Christian doctrine, and holy and unblemished lives, ought to have exempted them from the intemperate censures of writers who seem to think an indiscriminate aversion to the Church of Rome to be one of the principal excellences of a Protestant historian.

"But it is time to bring the English Church history of this century to a close. That there was a

real effusion of the Holy Spirit on England, so that numbers were turned from idols to the living God; that pastors, first of the Roman, and afterwards of the British communion, laboured in the work with simplicity and success, has been evidenced.

"Let it suffice us to say, that our ancestors saw in this century a blessed time, the fruits of which will abide for ever.

"The erection of many convents in Germany for the Scotch and Irish, some of which are still extant, is to be accounted for from the ecclesiastical connexions of their ancestors. Many persons travelled from Great Britain and Ireland with the laudable purpose of preaching Christ in Batavia, Belgium and Germany. And, however superstition might tarnish their labours, there must have been a nobler principle to have induced men to undergo so much danger, with hardly any possible prospect of lucre or of fame. Mere philosophers are generally but too liberal in censure and raillery: we seldom, however, hear of them engaging in any work of so disinterested a nature. *The love of God in Christ alone can support the spirit of men in such enterprises.*

"Colomban, an Irish monk, distinguished from him of the same name, spoken of before, who was called "the Ancient," towards the close of the foregoing century had extirpated the remains of expiring Paganism in France. He also passed the Rhine, and evangelized the Suevi, the Boii, and other German nations. He laboured in the cause to his death, which happened in the year 615. Gal, one of his companions, laboured with much zeal about the lakes of Zurich and Constance. Near the latter lake, at a little distance from Bre-

gent, he erected a monastery, which still bears his name. In fortitude and labouriousness he was inferior to none of the missionaries of this age."

We are at length, my friends, arrived at the eighth century. *Where*, I again ask, all this time, were the evangelizing Calvinists and Lutherans—where were they? Listen, my friends, whether you can recognise the praise of a Scotch Calvinist, or a Church of England man in what Protestant Milner says of the venerable Bede!

"The church history of our country, written by this renowned father, was continued to the year 731. I have extracted from it that which suited my purpose. He is said to have died in 735. Of his age the accounts are very contradictory. The history of the century will properly begin with a brief narrative of the life and works of this historian.

"He was born near Durham, in a village now called Farrow, near the mouth of the Tyne. Losing both his parents at the age of seven years, he was, by the care of relations, placed in the monastery of Weremouth, was there educated with much strictness, and appears from his youth to have been devoted to the service of God. He was afterwards removed to the neighbouring monastery of Jerrow, where he ended his days. He was looked on as the most learned man of his time. Prayer, writing, and teaching, were his familiar employments during his whole life. He was ordained deacon in the nineteenth, and presbyter in the thirtieth year of his age. He gave himself wholly to the study of the Scripture, the instruction of disciples, the offices of public worship, and the composition of religious and literary works. The life of such a person

can admit of little variety. It was not, however, for want of opportunity that he lived thus obscure. His character was celebrated through the western world: the bishop of Rome invited him warmly to the metropolis of the Church; but, in the eyes of Bede, the great world had no charms. It does not appear that he ever left England; and, however infected with the fashionable devotion to the Roman see, he was evidently sincere and disinterested.

"Constantly engaged in reading or writing, he made all his studies subservient to devotion. As he was sensible that it is by the grace of God, rather than by natural faculties, that the most profitable knowledge of the Scriptures is acquired, he mixed prayer with his studies. He never knew what it was to do nothing. He wrote on all the branches of knowledge then cultivated in Europe. In Greek and Hebrew he had a skill very uncommon in that barbarous age; and, by his instructions and example, he raised up many scholars. Knowledge, indeed, in those times was more familiar in the British isles than in any part of Europe.

"The catalogue of Bede's works exhibits the proofs of his amazing industry. His Church History is to us the most valuable, because it is the only British monument of the Church which we have for the seventh century. His expositions and homilies, however, must in that dearth of knowledge have been abundantly useful. The ignorance of the times is indeed but too visible in him; and he followed Augustine and other fathers so closely, and collected so much from various authors, that his want of original genius is more than problematical. Genuine godliness, rather than taste and genius, appear on the face of

his writings. His labours in the sciences show a love of learning, however inconsiderable his acquisitions must appear in comparison with the attainments of the present age.

"In his last sickness he was afflicted with a difficulty of breathing for two weeks. His mind was, however, serene and cheerful; his affections were heavenly; and, amidst these infirmities, he daily taught his disciples. A great part of the night was employed in prayer and thanksgiving; and the first employment of the morning was to ruminate on the Scriptures, and to address his God in prayer. 'God scourgeth every son whom he receiveth,' was frequently in his mouth.

"Even amidst his bodily weakness, he was employed in writing two little treatises. Perceiving his end to draw near, he said, 'If my Maker please, I will go to him from the flesh, who, when I was not, formed me out of nothing. My soul desires to see Christ my king in his beauty.' He sung 'glory to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,' and expired with a sedateness, composure, and devotion that amazed all who saw and heard.

"But that was not yet the case: superstition itself, though deplorably childish and absurd, was not incompatible with sincerity and the fear of God. The real nature of the Gospel, and its practical exercise in faith, humility, and true mortification of sin, were understood and felt by the Saxon presbyter, whose comments on St. Paul's Epistles are, in depth of understanding and penetration into the sacred sense, even with all the defects of the times, greatly superior to several admired expositions of this, which calls itself an enlightened age."

And here, my friends, let us

anxiously take a dive into all the dens and caverns and fastnesses of England as we go along, in expectation that we may see at least *the shadow* of a Protestant.

But it is time, my friends, to hasten to the eighth century, and hear what your Protestant Milner, the ecclesiastical historian, has to say of it, and especially of *venerable Bede*. Listen to his first introductory chapter.

"I shall venture to observe, what, however, no reader will be prepared to receive, unless his mind has been seasoned with a degree of experimental religion—that the comments of Bede are far more solid and judicious than those of many modern, improperly called rational divines.

"Our ancestors were, doubtless, much indebted under God to the Roman see. Christianity, before the missions of Gregory, was very low in England. A real spirit of godliness, the sincere practice and true understanding of the Gospel, had been, through the bishops of Rome, introduced among barbarians.

"While Bede lived, in no part of the world was godliness better understood and practised than among our ancestors. In a synod held by Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, about the middle of this century, at Cloveshoo, there were twelve prelates, with Ethelbald, king of the Mercians. The canons of this synod would have done honour to the purest times, and they seem to have been inspired by the genius of Bede. The clergy are directed to have fellowship with one another, to serve God in one spirit of faith, hope, and charity, to pray for one another, to attend to the duties of the Sabbath, and, in fine, the same things are repeated which are to be found in Bede's letter to Egbert.

"The people who served the Lord in the greatest purity and sincerity, seem to have been OUR ancestors."

And what people, let me ask my reverend friend, were these? Why, the consternation so visible in his countenance answers—They were *Roman Catholics*.

"The Jehovah of the sacred writings," continues Milner, "and the Almighty and All-perfect God, which may be discovered by sound reason, is an invisible Being, and is to be honoured, as a Spirit, with the heart and the understanding, and without the intervention of sensible objects, as stocks or stones. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul:' but the history of our corrupted nature shows, that images and other sensible objects have, in all ages, offered themselves to men's minds as guides and helps to a conception of the Deity; and if, in some instances, these absurd inventions of gross idolatry have been rejected by men of learning and refinement, it has then generally happened, that intellectual figments of philosophical vanity have been substituted in their place, figments still more atheistical in their nature, and farther removed from the notion of a wise and authoritative Governor of the universe, who enjoins the submission and dependence of his creatures, requires their obedience, and dispenses justice impartially."

But go we on, my friends, and let us hear portrayed the activities of Catholic saints, from age to age, when Lutheranism and Calvinism were as yet unborn.

"Willibrod, with other English missionaries, continued to labour with success in the conversion of the Frisons. His episcopal seat was, as we have seen, at Utrecht; for fifty years he preached, founded

churches and monasteries, and appointed new bishops. The consequence of his labours was, that great numbers of pagans were received into the pale of the Church.

"The great light of Germany in this century was an Englishman named Winfrid, born at Kirton in Devonshire, about the year 650. He was brought up in the monastic life from his infancy. His residence was in the monastery of Nutcell, in the diocese of Winchester, which was afterwards destroyed by the Danes, and was never rebuilt. Here he was made acquainted with the sacred and secular learning of the times. At the age of thirty he was ordained priest, on the recommendation of his abbot, and laboured with much zeal in preaching the word of God. His spirit was ardent, and he longed to be employed as a missionary in the conversion of pagans. The example of a number of pious persons of his own country might, no doubt, have great influence with him; for we have seen already, that the zeal of spreading the Gospel was peculiarly strong in the British isles. He went over with two monks into Friesland about the year 716. He proceeded to Utrecht, 'to WATER, where Willibrod had PLANTED;' but finding that circumstances rendered it impracticable at present to preach the Gospel there, he returned into England, with his companions, to his monastery.

"Winfrid returned into Friesland, and for three years co-operated with Willibrod. The pale of the Church was hence enlarged; churches were erected, many received the word of God, and idolatry was more and more subdued.

"In 732 Boniface received the title of archbishop from Gregory the Third, who supported his mission with the same spirit with which Gregory the Second had done. En-

couraged by a letter sent to him from Rome, he proceeded to erect new churches, and to extend the profession of the Gospel. At this time he found the Bavarian churches disturbed by an heretic, called Eremvolf, who would have seduced the people into idolatry. Boniface condemned him, according to the canons, freed the country from his devices, and restored the discipline of the church.

"About the year 732, Burchard and Lullus were invited from England by Boniface, who made the former bishop of Wurtzburg, where Kilian had preached, and suffered martyrdom, about fifty years before. He was abundantly successful during the labours of ten years, by which his strength was exhausted; he gave up his bishopric in 752, and died soon after."—*Butler*, vol. x.

"Some time after, Boniface wrote to Northelme, archbishop of Canterbury, in a strain which equally shows the charity and sincerity of his spirit, and the superstition of the times. In 738 he again visited Rome, being far advanced in life; and, after some stay, he induced several Englishmen, who resided there, to join with him in his German mission. Returning into Bavaria, by the desire of the Duke of Odilo, he restored the purity of the faith, and prevailed against the artifices of some seducers, who had done much mischief both by false doctrine and flagitious example. He established three new bishoprics in the country, at Saltzburg, Frisinghen, and Ratisbon. That of Passaw had been fixed before. It must, however, be observed, that the successes and conquests of the Carlovingian princes much facilitated his labours in Germany.

"In writing to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, after testifying his zealous adherence to the see of

Rome, and his submission to its authority, he exhorts him to discharge his duty faithfully, notwithstanding the difficulties to which good pastors were exposed. 'Let us fight,' says he, 'for the Lord; for we live in days of affliction and anguish. Let us die, if God so please, for the laws of our fathers, that with them we may obtain the heavenly inheritance. Let us not be as dumb dogs, sleepy watchmen, or selfish hirelings, but as careful and vigilant pastors, preaching to all ranks, as far as God shall enable us, in season and out of season, as Gregory writes in his Pastoral.'

"That Mosheim should inveigh against this missionary is what might be expected from his prejudices. But he should have written with consistency. He speaks of the pious labours of Boniface, of his finishing with glory the task he had undertaken, and of the assistance which he received from a number of pious men who repaired to him from England and France. 'His piety,' he adds, 'was ill rewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered. If we consider the eminent services he rendered to Christianity, the honourable title of The Apostle of the Germans will appear to have been not undeservedly bestowed.' Who could imagine that this pious pastor should, by the same writer, be accused without warrant of often 'employing violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians?' He ascribes to him also 'an imperious and arrogant temper, and a cunning and insidious turn of mind.'

"Which of these two accounts shall we believe? for it is as impossible that both should be true, as that piety should be consistent with a spirit of violence, arrogance and fraud. But it is thus that men

zealous to propagate divine truth in the earth are often described by those who arrogate to themselves the whole praise of judgment and candour. There has seldom existed an eminent and useful missionary who has not, in this way, been aspersed. In the mean time, I am sensible that the foundation of the strong prejudices against Boniface is his attachment to the Roman see. I cannot observe, however, that he either practised idolatry or taught false doctrine."

I want to show you, my friends, by these extracts—I wish to prove to you the sanctity and holiness of my Church in every age, notwithstanding the virulent calumnies incessantly poured forth by our enemies. I wish to prove to you that a Protestant historian, with a penetrating keenness and a beautiful style, took the pen in hand to enlighten all Europe on ecclesiastical history; and looking around on the broad field of virtue and religion for sanctity wherever he could find it, for pointing and illumining its features with the glowing touches of his style, can fix on no character in any age to effect his purpose, but that of the devoted CATHOLIC. Ah! my friends, what would my learned antagonist give, if, in these our perambulations through the pages of ecclesiastical history, a Calvinist were to rise up and call down upon his memory such bright *encomia* from the panegyriizing pen of Dean Milner!—[Laughter.]

However our missionaries, my friends, may be calumniated and maligned in these successive ages, it would require great power and ingenuity in us to calumniate theirs, for we should not know where to find them. [Laughter.]

"The most learned writer of this century," continues Milner, "if we except our countryman

Bede, seems to have been John of Damascus.

"In the doctrine of the Trinity, John appears to have been orthodox; in other respects, he was one of the most powerful supporters of error. He was an advocate for the practice of praying for the dead, which he regarded as effectual for the remission of sins."

Then he goes on describing all the glorious missionaries who were martyred in the cause of their adorable Redeemer, and not—and oh! mark, my friends—not the hem of a garment of any reforming sect is either to be seen or heard of. Tell me again, Where lurked ye, *O profound sleepers of antiquity! ye Lutherans and ye Calvinists!*

Well, gentlemen, we have got through the eighth century. Now we will go to the ninth century.

"The great Alfred was indeed raised up to defend his country against them. And one of his speeches, delivered to the soldiers before a battle, displays at once much good sense and a spirit of religion.

"It is pleasant to see the ebullitions of genius and of strong sense in an iron age like this before us. Alfred would, doubtless, in more auspicious times, have appeared among the first of mankind. There seems no reason to doubt the sincerity of his piety.

"There is reason, however, to believe, that a devotional, and probably an evangelical spirit, prevailed in some parts of the British isles; for monks, in Ireland and Scotland, who gave themselves to prayer, preaching and teaching in the middle ages, were called Culdees; that is, *Cultores Dei*. They were first known in this country by that name, at St. Andrew's particularly; but were never settled in England, except at St. Peter's in York."—*A. Butler*, vol. v.

Dean Milner then proceeds to describe the different saints that beamed through the ninth century, shedding the kindly influence of divine light amidst nations of barbarian darkness; and, amongst others, pays a tribute to the virtues of St. Methodius, who flourished in the year 861; and of Bogoris, who gave up his crown about the year 880, and retired into a monastery; and of Haymo, a monk of Fulda, a scholar of Alcuin, who was chosen bishop of Habersstadt in the year 841. Page 464.

He enters fully into the character of St. Anscarius, the illuminator of Denmark. (Page 465.) Listen to his words:—

"In the year 865 this apostle of the north was called to his rest. He had lived six years after the union of the dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen, and had applied himself to the duties of his office, both as a governor and a preacher of the Church, with indefatigable assiduity. A terror to the proud, and a comfort to the humble, he knew how to divide the word of truth, and to give to each of the flock his portion in due season. In all good works, and particularly in his care of redeeming captives, he was eminently distinguished. He erected an hospital at Bremen, in which passengers were relieved, and the sick were taken care of; which, in that rude age, was an uncommon instance of liberality and compassion. His example and authority had great influence even among those who sold captives to pagans, or kept them in slavery: they were induced by his exhortations to set the prisoners at liberty. He is said to have had the gift of miracles; and, though I cannot give full credit to the most plausible stories of this nature which are related of him, because of the superstitious credulity and fraudulent

inventions of the times, I must confess, with Fleury, that if ever the gift of miracles may be supposed to have existed after the first ages of Christianity, it may be believed most probably to have been vouchsafed to those who were concerned in the first plantation of churches. And it should be remembered, that Sweden and Denmark were, under God, indebted to Anscarius for the first light of the Gospel. This extraordinary person, however, was by no means disposed to value himself on miraculous powers: as he appeared to have been acquainted with an holy influence of a more excellent nature. (1 Cor. xii. last verse.) 'If I had favour with God,' said he, one day when he heard his miracles extolled, 'I should beseech him to grant me one single miracle, even his grace to sanctify my nature.' It is remarked of him, that he never did anything without recommending himself first to God by prayer. A short fragment of an epistle to the bishops is the whole of his writings which I can find to be extant. 'I beg your earnest prayers to God for the growth and fruitfulness of this mission among the pagans. For, by the grace of God, the Church of Christ is now founded both in Denmark and Sweden; and the pastors discharge their office without molestation. May God Almighty make you all partakers of this work in godly charity, and joint heirs with Christ in heavenly glory!' The centuriators have charged him with idolatry; but the only proof which they give, is his superstitious attachment to relics—an evil so general, I had almost said UNIVERSAL, at that time, that it cannot fix any particular blot on the character of Anscarius. I see no proof of his having practised or encouraged image-worship. It is true, that he was devoted to the see of Rome.

And, in those days, how few were not so!

"Nelson is of the same opinion. 'Q. Does it seem probable, that it the conversion of infidels were attempted by men of honest and sincere minds, God would extraordinarily countenance such a design? A. 'Tis agreeable to reason to think he would, and in no way contrary to Scripture. For as the wisdom of God is never found to be prodigal in multiplying the effects of his Almighty power, so it is never wanting to afford all necessary evidences and motives of conversion.'—*Nelson's Festivals*, p. 259.

"Rembert, his confidant, was appointed bishop of Bremen, by the dying words of the apostle. He wrote the life of his predecessor, a treatise which seems to have furnished historians with the greatest part of their materials concerning Anscarius. Rembert himself presided over the church of the north for twenty-three years, and established their discipline and ecclesiastical consistence. He was not unworthy of the confidence of his predecessor, and lived and died an example of piety. He began to preach among the people of Brandenburg, which hitherto had been altogether pagan, and made some progress towards their conversion. He died in 888.

"Jeron, an English presbyter, went over to Holland in this century, and preached the Gospel there; and, so far as appears, with faithfulness. He was crowned with martyrdom about the year 849.

"Patto, a Scotch abbot, was appointed bishop of Verden by Charlemagne. The centuriators only tell us, that he strenuously supported Popish corruptions and human traditions. But Crantzius, from whom they collected this account, would have informed them

also of better things. Patto, it appears, had great success among the infidels, but was grieved to see Christian professors disgracing the faith by their vices. He faithfully rebuked them; and for his honest zeal in preaching against the sins of nominal Christians was murdered about the year 815.

"Tanes, who had succeeded Patto in the Scotch abbey, after a time left his situation, and followed his countryman in Germany, not so much with a desire of martyrdom, say the centuriators, as of obtaining a richer benefice. Uncharitable surmise! There is too much of this leaven to be found in a work which, in other respects, abounds in piety and industry. The same Crantzius informs us, that Tanes, in fact, laboured in conjunction with Patto, and, after a while, was appointed his successor to the see of Verden. Were the sufferings and hardships which Patto and himself had sustained among barbarians likely to render the bishopric of Verden an enviable object of ambition?"

"The reader, I hope, has seen, in this dark century, a clear demonstration that the Church of Christ still existed."

Here, my friends, you hear an account of Scotch abbots, Scotch saints, Scotch missionaries, flashing with the cross in hand through the gloom of ages; all busied in their grand work, the propagation of Christianity amongst idolatrous infidels; and not a single trace of the Calvinist was to be found among them!

Let us now hear what Protestant Milner says of the tenth century. "Infidel malice," says he, "has with pleasure recorded the vices and the crimes of the Popes of this century. Nor is it my intention to attempt to palliate the account of their wickedness. But let it never

be forgotten, my friends, that in this tenth century there was many a bright exemplar of the sanctity of the church. St. Ephege and Lanfranc, archbishops of Canterbury, the prelates Burcard of Worms, Fulbert, and Ivo of Chartres, Odilo, an abbot, Algar, a monk, Guitmond, and Theophylactus. The crown was also now adorned with saints. In England shone St. Edward the Confessor; in Scotland," my reverend opponent's birth-place, "St. Margaret; in Germany, St. Henry; in Hungary, St. Stephen. The cloister was also enriched with the Cistercian Order by St. Robert; the Carthusian Order was founded by St. Bruno; the Order of Valambrosa, by St. John Gualbert."

But before we conclude this tenth century, hear Protestant Milner once more:

"Such," says he, (page 476,) "were the apostolic missionaries. Such in a good degree were the missionaries of the dark ages which we are reviewing." In the same page, speaking of Protestant England, he has these remarkable words:—

"With every advantage in our hands for the propagation of the Gospel, we have done very little indeed; and the annals of the several dark ages we have reviewed have exhibited a spirit of adventurous charity unknown to those who now boast themselves as the most enlightened and the most philosophic of mankind."

Gentlemen, I have not time to record the names of Catholic missionaries in the eleventh century, if we may believe Protestant Milner, who were active in extending the pale of the Church by their pious labours. I shall content myself with one or two extracts, which I must read with the utmost rapidity.

"Boniface, in particular, and

eighteen other persons, set out from Germany, to labour among the Prussians, and were massacred by that barbarous people. They seem to have been among the last of the European nations who submitted to the yoke of Christ. In the zealous attempts made, however, for their conversion, though unsuccessful, we see abundant proofs that the spirit of propagating the Gospel, which was the brightest gem of these dark ages, still existed.

"Nor can I doubt but many at this day who boast of their exemption from papal ignorance, and who call themselves enlightened, because they have been refined by philosophical and political knowledge, are themselves much inferior in Christian light and spirit to many who lived in the dark times of the eleventh century, under the benefit of such advantages of instruction as the canon before us afforded."

He then comes to that solid, genuine, apostolical ornament of England, the immortal Anselm!

"As a divine," says Protestant Milner, "he was the first of characters in this century, and will, therefore, deserve some attention." Now listen attentively to what this Protestant historian says further with relation to Anselm.

"Thus did Anselm employ himself in the defence of divine truth and serious religion. His knowledge of the Scriptures was, I am persuaded, so sound, and his love of them so sincere, that if he had met with direct opposition, on these infinitely momentous subjects, from the court of Rome, he would have sooner pronounced the Pope to be antichrist than have parted with his evangelical sentiments and profession.

"Indeed, every precious fundamental of Christianity appears in

his writings. Remove the rubbish of superstition, and view the inward man; and you see in Anselm all that is vital and essential in godliness.

"Anselm was one of these. Amidst the gloom of superstition with which he was surrounded, he was yet enabled to describe and vindicate every fundamental of evangelical doctrine; though a papist, he appeals to the Scriptures: he expounds them, by opening the plain grammatical sense of St. Paul; and it behoves men who call themselves Protestants, or who boast of the superior light of this age, to confute his arguments, or at least to own that they do not believe the Scriptures to be divine.

"It is allowed, even by his enemies, that his life was in the right: and all the true holiness of practice which has appeared in the world has ever originated from such doctrines as he professed."

We are now arrived at the twelfth century. How does the Protestant historian commence it? Listen.

"A great luminary strikes our attention at the entrance of this century—the famous Bernard, abbot of Clairval. As the general scene of our history still continues dark and gloomy, let us stick close to the splendid object. At least I would wish to exhibit a just estimate of the life, character, and writings of this renowned saint. For the subject may not only throw a considerable light on the religion and manners of this century, but will also illustrate that connexion between Christian doctrine and practice which it is the principal design of this work to explore from age to age.

"The love of God appears to have taken deep root in his soul, and seems to have been always

steady, though always ardent. His charity was equal to his zeal; and his tenderness and compassion to Christian brethren went hand in hand with his severity against the heretical, the profane, and the vicious. In humility he was truly admirable; he scarce seems to have felt a glimpse of pleasure on account of the extravagant praises every where bestowed upon him."

Nor does this Protestant historian, Milner, defraud the Church of its due sanctity in the thirteenth century. He enumerates the saints as usual;—a St. Arsenius, bishop of Constantinople; John Scot, an Englishman, Archdeacon of St. Andrews; the famous St. Francis of Assisium, founder of the Minor-friars; and his contemporary St. Dominic, founder of the Order of the Dominicans:—and then Protestant Milner is most copious in panegyricizing the great St. Lewis, king of France.

"With great pleasure," says he, (page 567,) "I dwell on a character so singularly excellent." He then launches out into the most enthusiastic encomiums on the character of Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. Page 571.

Lastly, in the fourteenth century, an Englishman named Bradwardine, archbishop of Canterbury, and St. Eleazar, count of Arian, in Naples, call forth the unbounded admiration of the Protestant historian, Milner.

O glorious Catholicity, how in every age dost thou not extort the praises of thine enemies! You thus see, my friends, that it is most indisputably evident from this laborious reading; though I would rather be exerting my lungs another way, and, like my learned friend, rather have indulged my little vein of oratory than have read so much. But I thought it was necessary to

prove, by Protestant as well as by Catholic historians, that you are indebted solely for the seeds of Christianity to the missionary efforts of your Catholic ancestors; that to them is attributable all the piety that reigns in this country; that to them we owe all those beautiful prayers of true and heart-stirring unctuous devotion which run through some of your Protestant books, especially your Liturgy. The great Jeremy Taylor, that bright metaphysical writer, whatever there is of sanctity in his beautiful works, it is pilfered from the pages of our Catholic priests. His brilliant metaphors are his own, but that is all. To them you owe *every thing*; and ought you not, constrained by a feeling of gratitude, to suppress these murmurings against your spiritual benefactors, your fellow Catholics? Why do you take delight in hearing such virulent invectives as are incessantly being poured forth against them from this room; excluding them from the beatitude of heaven, as if they were addicted to idolatry and crime? And, oh! my friends, whilst you thus have the opportunity of hearing these arguments and illustrations, look narrowly and observantly, I beseech you, for the remaining years of your life, at the practice of the Catholic religion. I do not mean thereby the practice of those who merely preach Catholicity, and call themselves so, without cherishing an inward love and veneration for its practices: but look ye at those who approach our holiest altars, and who feed on the heavenly manna of Divine love; look on the conduct of the men and women with whom ye may become acquainted, if placed within reach of those who are in the habit of frequenting our holy sacrament; and then

you will see what real devotion is, such devotion as you have not the faintest idea of or semblance in your conventicles. All is certainly very pompous, orderly and solemn in your service; an eloquent preacher ascends your pulpit with innumerable texts in store, which he pours forth like Hybla drops with unparalleled rapidity, having it in his power, by constant practice, to adorn his speeches with every species of fantastic embellishment and studied elegance: all this, I grant you, you have in abundance; but you must go and behold the Catholic prostrate at his altar, if you want to see the essence of true and heartfelt devotion—[sensation]—as you find it described in the sweet, the unimitated pages of an ever inimitable Thomas à Kempis! There is a text, my Protestant friends, which I should wish to amplify a little upon this evening, but unfortunately I find I have scarcely time to do it. It is a text which I had marked as being peculiarly appropriate to be addressed to the Catholic part of my audience rather than to the Protestant. I say it without meaning to give the least offence. It is from Paul (Rom. xiv. 1), “Him that is weak in the faith receive you, but not to doubtful disputation.”

And why, my friends, do I not address this equally to my Protestant brethren?—my “enlightened” brethren, as my friend characteristically calls them. [A laugh.] It is, my friends, because ye are totally unable to give a person, should any such person be in this room at present, who, having the wish and anxiously seeking and desiring to become a Christian, and looking for the true religion,—you are unable, I say, to give such an answer, should he ask you in the words of the man in the Gospel to

our blessed Saviour:—“What shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Ye are unable to give to an inquirer of this kind such a rational answer as shall set for ever “all doubtful disputation” at defiance. I speak plainly, my friends. You are totally unable to substantiate the tenets of your respective creeds by any learning, human or divine, saving and except the infallibility of your own dictates in interpreting the sacred volume for yourselves. It is, my friends, because every page of the Gospel, together with almost every page of primitive antiquity, is at open war with your newly-fangled doctrines, and especially with that liberty which ye all alike assume, (Protestants of every denomination) *the right of interpreting for yourselves* the sacred volume, which the Gospel itself, as well as the primitive interpreters of the Gospel, all unanimously declare was to be interpreted by those alone “*to whom were committed the oracles of God*.”—“the priest’s lips shall keep knowledge,” (for I insist upon that “*shall*”) “and ye shall seek the law at his mouth, for he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts.”

Again: “No Scripture is of private interpretation,” says the apostle, according to the Protestant version. But it is not so; it is badly translated by the English. The original is, “and no Scripture is of private *disentangling or unravelling*,” alluding most evidently to passages that might, by ignorance or instability, be *wrested to the damnation of individuals*. You must, therefore, have recourse to the *Church of Ages*, the Church that has ever existed in every age; that has converted all nations; that has handed down to you that incomparable boon, the Bible, and has taught you all the soul-saving, soul-

elevating views of vital Christianity. Lastly, my friends, it is because by this your usurped liberty of interpreting for yourselves, that, instead of solemn and sweetest harmony, the offspring of venerable and primitive antiquity, every species of contrariety, and discord, and "doubtful disputation," is evermore being engendered among you. The Anabaptist has one meaning on some particular text, the Quaker has another; the Socinian another, the Calvinist another, the Lutheran has another; and when they diverge from these innumerable differences, and meet together in one point to oppose *Catholicity*, then, forsooth, they deal out their fine-spun compliments to one another, and say, "Oh, we *differ but on some lesser points*." No, my friends, such is not a *true* picture of your manifold differences. I speak the truth, and I speak it boldly—Ye differ in *fundamental* points. The Anabaptist, he will tell you that he believes in dipping. He knows very well that, according to his idea, if the Bible alone be the general guide, our baptism is a mere empty ceremony, and that we are not baptized in a proper manner. The Quaker again thinks that baptism is *not* "necessary to salvation;" that the words are to be taken "metaphorically," "orientally," and spiritually, and that it must be a spiritual baptism.

And these, my friends, are the *lesser* differences, too minute, forsooth, to mar or to disfigure the peace and unanimity of Protestants! The Calvinist maintains that baptism may be demanded as a seal, but is not "necessary;" and this, too, is an inferior point! One person says on a certain text, that women are commanded to be silent in church; another reads that they ought to be loquacious; and I have actually known a Quaker woman as loqua-

cious and almost as erratic as my reverend friend. [Laughter.]

Lastly, gentlemen, if my learned friend, since he has laid down the Bible to be the solid, soul-saving, soul-enlightening Rule of Faith to the Christian, will he have the kindness to point out any text in the Bible which tells him that it is so? Will he have the kindness to account for the loss of many inspired books? Bishop Watson tells us that the Letter of Paul to the Laodiceans is lost; that the Epistle to Barnabas is also lost; and history also tells us that many inspired books are lost for ever. Will he be so good as to tell me how this Rule of Faith could operate for so many centuries before the art of printing was invented? Then, again, I ask him if he cannot tell me, has a new Rule of Faith sprung up in the nineteenth or fourteenth century? and is that Rule of Faith, which is confessedly of apostolical and inspired ages, to be totally set aside? and the moment that a corrupt translation of the Bible was scattered over the world, were the priests of God to be silenced; their inalienable prerogative to cease; and that part to be expunged from the Bible, namely, "The priest's lips shall keep knowledge, for he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts?" No, my friends, so long as the pillars of the earth stand, "so long as the sun and moon endureth," that passage will stand in unshaken truth. The Jews themselves tell you, that when in their own Church difficulties arose, they were invariably left to the *decision of the Church*; and the Catholic has unintermittingly preached the same doctrine. But in these present times a set of men have arisen, who, instead of following apostolical tradition, chalk out, with an astonishing degree of self-sufficiency, a tradition for them-

selves! My learned friend tells me that I cannot prove tradition; let me, therefore, give him this plain text:—2 Thess. ii. 15.—“Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and *hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.*” And mark, my friends, it was by “word,” and not by “epistle,” that the barbarian nations of the earth were converted by our Catholic ancestors.

Again, nearly seventy years elapsed before the New Testament was written, and how many years before it was disseminated! Think ye, during that time—think ye that the priests of the living God were hiding themselves in caverns? No, my friends, they were scaling the high mountains of the heathen and barbarian; they were descending into the deep valleys, as yet slumbering in the shadows of ignorance and unblessed with the light of Christianity, with the crucifix in their hand, preaching the primitive *Catholic* religion, and no other; and you are entirely indebted in this land for Christianity itself to the zealous missionaries of that holy religion. [Sensation.]

Lastly, my friends, it is because in ancient times the motto of the Christian was, when THE CHURCH wrought these victories, “The humility of obedience;” the motto of Protestants is, and ever has been since that day, “The heroism of resistance.” Yes, my friends, it was in the full-fledged spirit of this impious, this daring motto, that your ancestors, the founders of the different sects that now reign among you, sundered from our great mother, the Church, uplifting an heretical banner for themselves, and introducing into the house of the one only God the principles of violence and discord, where all before was peace and harmony, brotherhood, and in-

dissoluble concord. And look, my friends, at what is the consequence—why, the man who allows his mind to be deceived into any of your sects, forfeits all repose and calm of spirit, and makes up his mind to become the subject of the denunciation of the most conspicuous text in the Gospel. Yes, my friends, in the language of St. Paul, God must give such a man “the spirit of slumber,” that, “having eyes that he may not see, and ears that he may not hear,” instead of exerting himself to agree with the doctrines of primitive antiquity, he becomes obnoxious to the Church as “a heathen man or publican;” that is, destitute of eternal life; Protestants of every sect and denomination seizing with avidity every text of the Bible, by the aid of which they may be able to annihilate the evidence of that Church which Christ himself has founded, by endeavouring to destroy obedience to it, and erecting in its stead a grievous apostasy.

Believe me, my Protestant brethren, I mean not to wound your feelings by pointing to your ancestors. They are not connected with you. You have been misled by dazzling accounts of them. Only read the manner by which they succeeded in establishing your church or churches, and you will soon become disgusted. My intention and my wish is, to excite a desire in you to seek for that Church, where, holding in your hands the words of primitive antiquity, you may be enabled to exclaim with one mind and with one mouth, that “you now glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” The Bible, you all exclaim, is the grand guide of Protestants; the Bible, I answer, is part of the sacred tradition of *the Church*; that is, the Catholic believes it to be what the Church tells

him it is, namely, *all Divine*. Without that Church we should not have known what the Bible is, and without it we have no right to interpret any one particle of fundamental text within it. But what is your gain, my Protestant brethren, by thus referring to the Bible? Why, the very moment that you open it, you see in large and legible letters, written, as it were, and engraven on its frontispiece as with sunbeams, that, under the menace of eternal torments, ye are bound to bow down your proud heads in the spirit of lowliness and submission to that one only *Church*, which both ministers and fulfils the sublime and farewell commission of the Saviour,

when he said, on ascending into glory: "*Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and, lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*"

Gentlemen, I have many more arguments, and——[The chairman here announced the expiration of the learned gentleman's time.]

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

NINTH EVENING, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1839.

SUBJECT:

RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued.)

Rev. J. CUMMING.—You will find, by referring to the original chapters of Milner, that my opponent gives as much of a sentence as appears to serve his purpose, and, by the ancient usages of his Church, called "pious frauds;" he then most quietly leaves out the very part that would tell exactly the other way. Mr. French's extracts, in almost every instance, are mutilated. The second-hand references which he furnishes do not always direct to the right part. When they do, let the reader follow him, and he will see that my opponent had only to read on to meet with the appropriate extinguisher. This is not fair to the author, nor just to you, nor creditable to my antagonist. I do not dread full, free, and impartial

discussion. It is a bad cause that stands in need of such support.

Mr. French, I observe, throughout, found it exceedingly convenient to quote certain parts of Dean Milner, and to skip over the intermediate and connecting parts which militate wholly against him. Hence he gave a sort of *rasa tabula*, if I may so express it, of asterisks, such as you sometimes see in public works, and as you will see will appear in the reports, if my opponent is just to Milner, by asterisks being placed where should have appeared the parts which he omitted, because he found the honest and un mutilated extracts would be detrimental to his argument. The course of his speech may be thus dignified. I must spend some little

time in reading to you extracts from Dean Milner (as my opponent makes him a nose of wax), to show you that Milner is not the unqualified panegyrist of the Roman Catholic Church. I will refer you to one extract from his works descriptive of the state of matters in the fourth century. For you will remember that my learned antagonist referred to successive centuries, beginning with the fourth, in all of which he would make you think Milner saw and praised Popery. He says here [turning to Mr. French]—it is the same edition as your own, page 204; indeed, I was so anxious to have the correct edition, that, finding it was an edition published in one volume, I went and purchased it yesterday for the purpose of referring to the same identical passage. Now, mark! I gave you before, I think, a Roman Catholic historian's description, which was black enough and dark enough, I am sure. Now I will give you a few extracts from Dean Milner, a Protestant, from whom he has quoted, as to the state of matters when the Roman Catholic Church, according to my antagonist, was alone in her glory, and during several successive centuries before the Reformation. Speaking of the fourth century, Dean Milner says, "Scarce a luminary of godliness existed. This whole period, as well as the whole scene of the persecution, is very barren of such characters. Those who suffered found no pastor to discountenance their self-will and false zeal. Eusebius observes that pastors of churches were condemned to take care of camels and to feed the emperor's horses." Page 204, 205.

Then he goes on further to observe, at page 210, "As it was difficult to clear Origen of depreciating the divinity of Christ, so it

is still more difficult to exculpate Eusebius."

"His sermons breathe little of Christianity."

And again, page 211, "The doctrine of real conversion was very much lost, or external baptism was placed in its stead; and the true doctrine of justification by faith, and the true practical use of a crucified Saviour for troubled consciences, was scarcely to be seen at this time."

At page 212, "Yet feuds, contentions, and the most unworthy spirit of avarice and ambition, appear very prevalent."

"Pure doctrinal truth was too commonly mere speculation."

Again, I read another description of the fourth century at page 278, at last column, at the bottom of the column.—"Monasticism continued to make rapid progress through the whole century. It is not worth while to trace its progress particularly, nor to recite any of the ridiculous frands, abuses, and superstitions which were connected with it. Self-righteous formality made rapid strides in the Christian world."

Then he goes on to add, "That these countries, which were before the most part void of the doctrine of Christ, might receive spiritual advantage from these superstitious men, is probable, because some genuine piety was doubtless among them. Superstition drawing with it something of real Christianity, may bring a blessing to countries altogether profane or idolatrous; to a people already evangelized it can only act as a poison." Page 279.

Again, I quote another passage from Dean Milner, from page 373, and first column, on the fifth century. "Superstition had grown gradually in this and the former century. Relics, and various other instruments

of the same class, were fast advancing into reputation. The monastic solitudes were strongly calculated to augment these evils. The general current of corrupt doctrine was strongly set in: idolatry was too deeply rooted in men's hearts to be eradicated from any except those who were Christians indeed, and we shall ere long see it established in the formality of public worship." Page 373.

Again, describing the sixth century, at page 411, where there are some remarks about Gregory, he says:—"In obedience to Gregory's directions, they proceeded on their journey; but their hearts failed them when they reflected on the difficulties and dangers to which they thought themselves likely to be exposed. The faith, and zeal, and simplicity of a Christian missionary were grown rare in the world."

From the extracts of my opponent you would have thought that the millennium had then dawned upon the world; whereas the real account of the matter is, that there was such a mighty power accompanying the Gospel, that all the rampant superstitions of the growing Roman Catholic Church were not able to depress or put it down. Its everlasting and inherent energies made it spring up with renewed elasticity and strength, notwithstanding the tremendous corruptions by which it was darkened and overwhelmed!

Again, I read at page 438, same edition, respecting Gregory the Second:—"He who filled the see of Rome at this time was Gregory the Second, whom, for *his open defence and support of idolatry*, I shall venture to call the first pope of Rome. I have for the most part been silent concerning the Roman bishops, *because very little of godliness appeared among them*. The open avowal

of idolatry was reserved for Gregory the Second."

Again, at page 451 (century ninth):—

"Here and there a glimmering ray of the sun of righteousness appears.

"Several circumstances attended the thick darkness which pervaded this century, and they appear to be reducible to the following:—Ignorance and superstition were so predominant, and idolatry was practically supported by the whole power and influence of the popedom."

Now observe that Milner says here, in plain terms, that the Pope of Rome supported idolatry; but the extracts which my antagonist quoted from Milner were intended to show that Milner was friendly to the Roman Catholic Church and to its purity. But observe, he does not hesitate (as my extracts evince) to pronounce the Church of Rome as characterized by idolatry; and draws from it the inference that Pope Gregory the Second, who was one of the early popes, *patronized idolatry*. And again, you will recollect that my learned antagonist referred to a fact in the history of Alfred, as to the condition of the Roman Catholic Church throughout Great Britain in the reign of Alfred. He quoted several highly coloured and eulogistic passages. Now I think it an unfair thing, when a Roman Catholic takes his favourite authors, just to give you a slice here and there according to his own particular idiosyncrasy. By this you might naturally be led to imagine that such was the case with every writer when treating of the condition of the Roman Catholic Church, and that there was nothing in reality to be gathered from them but one overwhelming torrent of applause and panegyric upon the tenets and influence of the Roman Catholic com-

munion. But it is not so. As I told you from the very first, read honestly, or read not at all. I have quoted Thomas Aquinas, and Augustine, and Jerome. I have quoted cardinals and "seraphic doctors," and others, and that, too, immediately after my opponent's panegyrics; and we found that they inculcated the grossest superstitions or the most exterminating principles of persecution; and my learned antagonist, very politely recanting and abjuring his previous praises, cast favourite doctors and fathers completely overboard along with the rest. [A laugh.] I have now shown by actual reference that Milner *opposes*, not approves, Romanism; and I now expect that when he rises he will treat Dean Milner in the same way that he treated Augustine, Aquinas, &c. Now, what a great pity it is that he did not read Milner beforehand, and thus have superseded the necessity of a third night of the discussion! I speak plainly to my learned antagonist [turning to Mr. French]: that Milner was in any way tinctured with Romanism, must have been the assertion of one who had never read a page of the author; for the inference which we come to when we open his work is, that he is one of the staunchest of Protestants; just as if there had fallen on him a shred of the mantle of Knox, instead of a purple and scarlet rag of the vaunted successor of St. Peter. I quote a passage my opponent skipped, I fancy, by the merest accident.

"In the preface to Gregory's Pastoral, a book translated into English by Alfred for the benefit of his subjects, he observes, that when he came to the crown there were very few priests south of the Humber who understood the common prayers in English, or who could translate a passage of Latin into the

language of their country."—Cent. Ninth, page 453.

Yet no reformation was needed! The middle centuries, forsooth, were so many millennia! It was a sad blunder for my opponent to touch authentic history.

You will recollect that my learned antagonist was quoting on each side of this passage, passages you fancied to be eulogistic of the state of religion at that period; and you recollect that when he came to describe the reign of Alfred, and found that the priests of that period could not translate a page of Latin, nor read a scrap of English, he seemed (to borrow an Irish illustration) as if he had taken a hot potatoe, supposing it had lost its caloric, into his mouth, and was anxious to get rid of it with as little spluttering and as few grimaces as he possibly could [laughter]; for he hurried over the remote points in this description in the most railroad and impetuous style, and made a dash with infinite glee at what he thought a glowing panegyric on the learning, morals, and glories of that era when no Luthers disturbed the slumbers of the Vatican. Now, really, the state of things was quite the opposite of that my opponent's potent logic made out. I will refer again to the passage. It tells us in the plainest and simplest terms, that the priests *could not read the common prayers, and could not translate a passage of Latin into the vernacular tongue*; and *these*, mark you, are the *channels* through which the traditions of Rome have emanated; these are the conduit-pipes through which tradition has come. Surely the presumption is strong, nay, the certainty is absolute, that traditions coming through such ignoramuses—men who had been thus steeped so deeply in error and ignorance, could not be very pure or unpolluted,

could not be the primeval tradition of the truth of the Gospel; and I would give you an immensity more of the same kind from Milner, descriptive of the growth and spread of ignorance and error; but, hurrying on to century the sixteenth, I can only spare time to glance at it. I might refer also to passages which I have not marked, in which the Pope is called antichrist in the eleventh century—as I have shown you before that Milner did not hesitate so to pronounce him. But I pass on to the sixteenth century. Page 660.

“The sixteenth century,” says Milner, “opened with a prospect of all others the most gloomy. Corruption both in doctrine and practice had exceeded all bounds. The Roman pontiffs were the patrons of impiety.” “Scandalous crimes of Pope Alexander the Sixth.”—“Ferocity of Julius the Second.”

And then he goes on to describe what was the whole state of matters in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; showing that ignorance, crime, and barbarism had progressed in a tremendous ratio, and that everything like real and vital religion had sunk to a wofully low ebb. Let it be distinctly recollected, Mr. French declined to admit or acquiesce in those descriptions of the corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church furnished by Baronius, one of his own historians; and, in order to neutralize the delineations of Baronius, or to retaliate, had recourse to Dean Milner, one of our historians; but it now turns out that, of all the references which the learned gentleman in his plunging for a footing could have made, the most unfortunate was his reference to Milner; for you see that instead of Milner being the advocate of Roman Catholic peculiarities, as he (Mr. French) contended, he is one of the staunchest

and most uncompromising Protestants, I think, I have quoted, and one such as a Protestant audience must be satisfied with.

In the outset of my remarks, last evening, I brought forward many positions which you will recollect my antagonist has not *touched*—he did not refer to *one* of them; but, instead of that, he read to you an elaborate statement in reply to something which I had never said, and supplied something which I had *not* omitted; and, therefore, I refer my learned antagonist to my opening speech of that evening, and hope that in his next address he will reply to it; and I beg him most earnestly, if he would be so kind, to take that speech and tear it in pieces *if* he can.

You will recollect, I first opened to you the glory, the fulness, and the beauty of our Rule of Faith; you recollect, I laid that Rule of Faith upon the table, namely, the word of God, and the word of God alone, and I requested my learned antagonist to lay his Rule of Faith side by side by it. That he has not done. That he dare not and cannot do. You will recollect that I also entered on the subject of his Rule of Faith, and after I had laid before you the Protestant Rule of Faith, which is the Bible, I submitted the claims of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith; which is the written word, and the unwritten word expounded by the Church; and from that instant (after coming to the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith) we passed from the regions of light into the regions of murkiness and shadows; from the noonday of clearness to the midnight of intensest darkness. Tradition is the capital of the popedom. It can be turned to any account, manufactured into any shape, being intended to give power to the priest, not direction to the

people. It commenced in fraud; it is perpetuated by interested men; and forms in all controversies on this question a sort of muddy and ever-moving element, in which such sharp-shooters as my opponent may fight and hide, and hide and fight, for ever. The only wonder is, that educated men, who have no purpose to subserve, can keep up so ridiculous a piece of imposition.

Again, I showed you from my last speech, first of all, that if private judgment exercised on the word of God as the only Rule of Faith is so liable to uncertainty, and so evidently unsafe, it follows that Roman Catholics are exactly in the same position, and liable to the same uncertainty, for they have the whole superstructure of their faith, which they believe to be infallible, dependent on the exercise of private judgment on the oracles of God. For, observe, I stated that before a Roman Catholic can reach his Rule of Faith, he must first of all prove that the *Scriptures are inspired*, then that Christianity is true, then that there was to be a Church on the earth, then that that Church is to be infallible, "and, last, though by no means least," that the Church of Rome is that Church. And then observe, after all these things have been proved by the appliance of private judgment to the word of God (for the Church of Rome absolutely hangs on private judgment, that frail and misguiding *ignis fatuus*, according to her repeated declaration); after having done all this, she then proclaims herself the infallible interpreter of God's word. She proves her infallibility by the Bible, and the Bible by her infallibility; and yet, is it not a curious fact, she has never yet *produced* an infallible interpretation of God's word? Now, what would you say of a per-

son who had neither bread nor raiment, and who was yet in the habit of making the enormous boast of his having thousands of pounds in his possession, but who never gave you any proof as to its reality? Would you not very naturally ask him to show you, it may be, even one thousand of this mighty amount, to give a trifle to destitute relatives; and if he refused to do so, and persisted in refusing to let you see it, though you pressed him for it long, why, the presumption would naturally be forced on you that he was making a false boast; that he was not possessed of it; that it was mere fancy, and an hallucination that had no foundation whatever in reality! Now, it is just so with your Church [turning to Mr. French]. Your Church pretends to have an infallible exposition in her possession, somewhere or another, of the whole of God's word; and yet, with a cruelty that is the characteristic of a stepmother, not with that affection which is the characteristic of a mother, she withholds that infallible exposition of God's word from millions that implore it.

Again, I maintain, in the second place, that in virtue of the second article of the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, namely, that you are not to interpret Scripture, unless "according to the *unanimous* consent of the fathers," I maintain that your mouths are practically shut for ever on the *interpretation* of God's word. You well know the fathers are *not* unanimous. You know they are contradictory of each other; and yet you are solemnly bound and enjoined, according to the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, not to interpret a passage of God's word, unless "according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." Remember, my Protestant friends,

that when a Roman Catholic stands up to give an exposition of the word of God, before he can do so, without subjecting himself to receive the penance prescribed by the priest—before he can do so, he has to ransack and range over the British Museum, (a thing which my learned antagonist is in the habit frequently of doing) in order to find out that *undiscoverable* thing, the “*unanimity of the fathers.*”

And then, in the next place, I stated that if you were to collect all the fathers and expositors of God’s word, all the various scholastic divines and doctors and cardinals that have appeared in various ages in the history of the world, and who constitute the unwritten word, mark what a magnificent exposition you would have. If you were to take one of Pickford’s largest “spring-vans” on the Birmingham railroad, it would not contain one-tenth of the expositions of fathers and scholastic doctors and divines who constitute part and parcel of the Roman Rule of Faith. [A laugh.] Conceive, then, what a Rule of Faith the Roman Catholic has—a Rule of Faith that requires a tremendous *van*—[laughter]—to carry, and ten ordinary lives to read! He must read musty folios, Greek and Latin, dance attendance on doctors, and, after he has spent “threescore years and ten” in searching for an unanimity never yet discovered, and never to be discovered, he sits down and becomes either an infidel, or puts his conscience in the priest’s pocket.

Oh, my dear Roman Catholic friends, you are awfully deceived! I implore you not to feed upon such garbage, but turn to the lively oracles of truth, which are able to “make you wise unto salvation, that the man of God may be perfectly furnished to every good work.”

You recollect, in the course of my learned antagonist’s remarks, he stated that we are dependent on tradition wholly for the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day of the week. Now I beg, in the first place, to remind my antagonist that Cardinal Ballarmine sees proved in Scripture that the Jewish Sabbath is not *binding* upon Christians; and the Epistle to the Colossians is confirmatory of the cardinal’s view, as well as several other places. Let me add, that our Lord appeared frequently on the first day of the week to his disciples, thereby consecrating it to solemn services; and the apostle Paul, who said he was “taught nothing by man, but by the revelation of Christ,” regarded the *first* day of the week as the Lord’s day, and spake of Christians assembling on it for worship as an usual thing. And then, in the Book of Revelations, or the Apocalypse, John speaks of the Lord’s day as the Christian Sabbath: “I was in the Spirit on the *Lord’s day*,” and the whole of the word of God, as I might show you, did time permit, presents invincible evidence that the Christian Sabbath is the first day of the week. Besides, history, which we respect and revere, while we repudiate all efforts to make it a part of the Rule of Faith, and distinguish it in all respects from the “old wives’ fables” of Roman tradition, records the fact that the first day of the week was the Christian Sabbath. History, with its thousand tongues, and Revelation, with one, proclaims this truth.

In the next place, remember, *the moral* of the fourth commandment is, that a seventh portion of your time shall be given to the service and worship of Jehovah; and the ceremonial, that this seventh portion is on the seventh day of the

week. To prove that the moral is the main thing, let it be borne in mind that it alone is everywhere the same; while the ceremonial is mutable with country, climate, and distance. It will be found that the Jew in London and the Jew in New South Wales do not observe the Sabbath on the seventh day. Our seventh day is the first at the Antipodes. Now, moral law is immutable; ceremonial is not so. It is therefore evident, that the Christian Church retains the moral, while the ceremonial, from sufficient authority, has been altered. So that, you will observe, there cannot be a moral obligation to keep the seventh day, because from the necessity arising from differences of latitude and longitude; while the moral part of the fourth commandment will endure as the sun, the same from the commencement to the close of creation; but *precedent* the most obvious, and precept the most sacred, warrant believers in observing the Sabbath of the Gospel on the first day of the week.

The moral part of the command is the consecration of *a seventh of your time* to the service of God; and the ceremonial was the dedication of that seventh portion on the seventh day or on the first. It is, therefore, abundantly obvious that we are not indebted to the Church of Rome, or her traditions (her stock-in-trade), for evidence of the change of the Sabbath. We prove it, and therefore we believe it, according to the apostolic injunction, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Should my opponent be yet unsatisfied (for Roman Catholics are so unaccustomed to prove, that it is difficult to make them understand it), I will enlarge and simplify the argument, in order to reach my in-docile opponent.

I was called to prove, in the next place, infant baptism without tradition. Now let me reply, that it is not necessary for me to enter upon proof, because Mr. French's own Bible (Douay) admits that infant baptism *can* be "*proved* from the Bible," and that is enough for me. I therefore refer him to the Douay Bible, and to follow me to the index, and read on the subject of baptism. Now, I am pronouncing no judgment, mark you, on the scriptural evidence of either infant or adult baptism. I merely state that the Douay Bible does hold infant baptism to be proveable from the word of God, and that Roman Catholics and I are agreed on this, and therefore need not waste time in proving it.

MR. FRENCH.—Read the passage [to Mr. Cumming].

REV. J. CUMMING.—[In compliance]—"For the baptism of infants, see St. Luke xviii. 16, compared with St. John iii. 5"—"But Jesus called them to him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." "Verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

So you see the Douay Bible *admits* that infant baptism, right or wrong in the estimate of any before me, can be proved from the word of God; and therefore it is quite sufficient: that I am not required to prove from the Bible, as my opponent admits it is capable of proof from the two texts above. But, as my learned friend is pleased to appeal to the Antipædobaptist part of his audience, and to say that infant baptism is not capable of proof from Scripture, and that they are right in rejecting it on the authority of Scripture alone, let him try to persuade either the Baptists

or their opponents of any doctrine from tradition. Can he do *that*? He very well knows that Baptists and Pædobaptists cast his traditions away from them as "filthy rags," not to be tolerated for a moment. If he cannot so much as prove it from the word of God (and mind, I pronounce at present no judgment on the subject, because not required), I maintain that he never *can* prove it from the airy and intangible traditions of his Church. We must not waste your time on a topic whereon Mr. French and I are thoroughly agreed. I have gone to his *own* Bible, and there it is admitted in the notes, that infant baptism, right or wrong, can be proved from the word of God; and likewise, I might refer to authorities from writers in his own Church.

My opponent, in searching after argument, hazarded the novel and unheard-of assertion, that seventy years had elapsed from the death of Christ before the word of God was written. Now, whether this was a *lapsus linguæ*, or an extract from the treasures of tradition, which generally evaporates the moment you come to analyse them, I cannot say. It is enough to state, that if he will refer to his own Bible, to which he seems a stranger, he will find that, so far from seventy years having elapsed from the resurrection of Christ to the penmanship of a part of the sacred oracles, that less than forty years elapsed; and what distinguishes these forty from all subsequent years is, that during their lapse the full noontide of inspiration radiated the minds and regulated the discourses of the sacred penmen. He also stated in his speech, that before the apostle Paul wrote to Timothy these words—"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for reproof, for correction, and in-

struction in righteousness"—these were only the Jewish or Old Testament Scriptures; and therefore, that the words of the apostle, so truly Protestant, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine," and so on, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work," can have referred to the Jewish Scriptures only. Let me implore the learned gentleman to read his own pet Douay Bible, and thereby cease to commit himself so often and so grossly; for, according to the Roman Catholic Bible, *three* of the Gospels were written before this time. Why, is my opponent not aware that almost all the Epistles of Paul were written before this time? Is he ignorant that the first Epistle of St. Peter was written before this time; and that when the apostle Paul said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," he did not include in Scripture merely the Old Testament Scriptures, but the three Gospels, and almost all his own Epistles, and the first Epistle of St. Peter? And therefore that text, so far from being restricted to the Old Testament Scriptures, I contend, is applicable to a vast proportion of the New Testament.—The next magnificent discovery of my learned antagonist was, that because the barbarians were enlightened and converted by the preaching of the Gospel, and not the reading of the Bible, therefore the word of God is not the Rule of Faith. Now you might just contend exactly in the same way, that, because every blind man cannot read God's word, therefore the Bible is not the Rule of Faith. [Laughter.] The apostle Paul had immediate inspiration

to guide him in his preaching; and we, his successors, have that inspiration embodied in the Scriptures to guide us. This argument of my opponent tells the other way. If the priests are inspired (and, as far as I can ascertain, their inspiration has in it no tokens of descent from above), they may convert and preach without the Bible; but we contend that what inspiration was to the apostles, the Bible is to us. We may preach, but our credentials and our proofs must be from the Scriptures.

He states, in the next place, that before the discovery of the art of printing, the Bible could not be circulated. Now, to show you how gross a mistake this is, and how liable tradition, as its advocate shows at every step, is to be misunderstood and mis-stated, I refer you to his own "golden mouth," the divine St. Chrysostom, on whom he lavishes praises when with him, and kicks out when opposed to him.

On the Utility of reading the Scriptures.—Serm. liii. tom. v. p. 601. "For the reading of the sacred Scriptures is a spiritual meadow, and a paradise of delights; a paradise of delights, moreover, far superior to that paradise. For God has planted this paradise, not upon earth, but in the souls of believers; he has not placed this paradise in Eden, nor in the east, confining it to one place; but he has expounded it everywhere upon the earth, and he extended it to the bounds of the world. And that you may see that he has diffused the Scriptures everywhere throughout the habitable world, hear the prophet saying—'Their sound is gone forth into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.' Whether you transport yourself to the Indies, whom the rising sun first regards;

whether you go to the ocean; whether you navigate the Black Sea, or depart to the southern regions, you hear all everywhere reasoning upon those things that are in the Scriptures, with a different voice, but with the same faith; with a different tongue, but with the same faith; with a different tongue, but with the same understanding. For the sound of the tongue differs, but the practice of religion does not differ; and they speak in a barbarous tongue, but they are wise in understanding; they commit errors in the sound, but they cultivate piety in their manners. Do you see the magnitude of the paradise which extends to the ends of the earth? Here there is no serpent, it is a spot free from wild beasts, and it is encircled by the grace of the Holy Spirit; and this paradise has also a fountain, as had the other one—a fountain whence spring not four only, but numberless rivers. For that fountain does not send forth to the Tigris, nor the Euphrates, nor the Egyptian Nile, nor the Indian Ganges—but innumerable streams. Who is it who declares this? The God himself who graciously presented us with those rivers. 'For whosoever believes in me,' he says, 'as saith the Scripture, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.' Do you perceive, not four rivers, but an infinite number, flowing from that fountain; but that fountain is not only wonderful on account of the multitude, but on account of the nature of the streams. For they are not streams of water, but gifts of the Spirit; that fountain is divided in each of the souls of the faithful, and is not diminished; it is divided, and it is not exhausted; it is scattered, and it is not lessened; it is entire among all, and it is entire in each. For such are the

gifts of the Spirit. Do you wish to know the abundance of those streams? Do you wish to know the nature of the waters, and how it is that they do not resemble the other waters, but are better and more wonderful? In order that you may learn the abundance of this fountain, hear again Christ himself saying to the woman of Samaria: 'The water,' he says, 'which I shall give to the believer, shall be in him a fountain of water springing up to eternal life.' He did not say 'going forth,' he did not say 'poured forth,' but 'springing up,' demonstrating to us its copiousness, by the springing up. Those water-springs are wont to spring up, and to flow on every side, which the fountains cannot contain in their bosoms, but subdued by the frequency of influx, scatter on every side. Wishing, therefore, to point out their great abundance, he said, springing up, not going forth. Do you wish also to learn its nature? Learn it from its use. For it is not useful for the present life, but for life eternal. Let us therefore pass our time in this paradise; let us sit beside this fountain, lest that which befel Adam should happen to us, and we should fall from paradise; lest we should receive destructive counsel, and welcome the fraud of the devil. Let us remain within it, for there is great safety therein. Let us remain in the reading of these Scriptures. For as those who sit near the fountain, and enjoy that air, and who, when the heat comes on, continually bedewing their face, drive away the summer heat with the waters, and are easily cured of the suffering of the thirst which vexes them, having the remedy near at hand in the fountain—thus he who sits near the fountain of the holy Scriptures, although he should perceive the flame of wicked lust troubling himself, would easily repel

the flame, having washed his soul with those streams; and if anger should trouble him, inflaming his heart like a burning cauldron, having imbibed a little of the water, he would immediately restrain the importunity of the suffering, and the reading of the divine Scriptures would rescue his soul from all evil thoughts, as from the middle of the fire. Wherefore, that great prophet, David, knowing the utility of the reading of the Scriptures, compares the man who is continually intent upon the Scriptures, and enjoys their conversation, to a plant always flourishing, standing near the rivulets of water, saying as follows:—'Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law will he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted near the water courses.' For as that tree, planted near the water courses, standing near those streams, having a continual abundance of irrigation, is unhurt by all the unseasonableness of the atmosphere, and fears not the warmest sunbeam, and does not dread the air when burning hot (for since it has included in itself sufficient moisture, it throws off the superabundance of all the heat of the sun falling upon it from without, and dispels it); so also the soul placed near the rivulets of the divine Scriptures, and continually drinking, collecting in itself those streams and the dew of the Spirit, shall be unharmed by all calamitous events; whether disease, or contumely, or calumny, or abuse, or censure, or any kind of irksome delay, or all the evils of the world, should assail such a soul, he will easily repel the burning of these evils, receiving a sufficient consolation from the reading of

the Scripture. For neither greatness of glory, nor amplitude of power, nor presence of friends, nor any other earthly thing can so console a man who is in grief, as the reading of the divine Scriptures. And why is this? Because the former are transitory and perishable, and therefore the consolation derived from them is also perishable; but the reading of the Scriptures is conversation with God. Since, therefore, God comforts him who is in grief, what created thing can plunge him in sorrow? Let us apply ourselves, therefore, to this reading, not two hours only (for this naked hearing is not sufficient for our safety), but continually. And let each when he has returned home take these books in his hand, and review in his thoughts the meaning of what has been said; that is to say, if he would derive continual and sufficient advantage from the Scriptures."

Now this extract, mind you, is taken from St. Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 398, that is, about four hundred years after the birth of our Lord. We find that men in every part of the world were using and meditating on the oracles of God; and that so far from the Bible not being circulated before the invention of printing, we find by one of his own favourite appeals, that the Bible was circulated in every land, and that there were Bible societies, *in fact*, if not in theory, in the days of St. Chrysostom.

The next point I come to are the unfounded criticisms of my antagonist's remarks on our authorized translation of the Bible. I had intended, if my time had not gone away so rapidly, I had intended to lay before you an account of the extraordinary care, learning, faithfulness, and talent which were concentrated

in our translations of the Scriptures. You will also remember that Cardinal Allen, who, I believe, was prosecuted for high treason in this country, and who, in consequence, was made a cardinal by the Pope; this individual, Allen, with a few other broken characters, were the translators of the Douay version of the Scriptures; and some other individuals of the college of Rheims were translators of the Rhemish Testament; both of which came out at a very early period, smothered with pestilential, murderous, and atrocious notes. With respect to our translation of the Scriptures, on the other hand, we find that King James appointed fifty-four learned men to this important labour, all distinguished for their piety, profound and consummate learning.

Their names alone are evidence:—*Lancelot Andrews*, bishop of Winchester.

John Overal, bishop of Norwich, indebted for his promotion to his great learning.

Adrian Saravia, the friend of Hooker and Whitgift.

Robert Teigh, spoken of by Wood as a profound linguist.

Bedwell, the first Arabic scholar of his age.

Liveley, professor of Hebrew at Cambridge.

Chadderton, of Emmanuel College, familiar with Hebrew and Greek, and versed in Rabbinical literature.

Harrison, vice-master of Trinity College, Cambridge, a first-rate linguist.

Reynolds, whose knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, Wood says, was almost miraculous.

Kilby, an Orientalist of profound scholarship.

Miles Smith, to whom Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek were as familiar as English.

Bois, the first Greek scholar of the age.

Bilson, Harding, &c.

I now hold in my hand testimonials from Dissenters and from Churchmen, and from one Roman Catholic (Dr. Geddes), all commendatory of our version, as one of the noblest versions of any age, and a monument of faithfulness and learning; and even Dr. Doyle stated, that "with all its faults and errors, it was a noble version." But to show you how my antagonist deals with the word of God, he told you that Luther, and (he added) consequently Protestants after him, in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. ix. ver. 5, had translated it thus, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a *wife*, as the other apostles?" In the Douay version it is, "*woman* and sister;" and you will recollect he contended that we had notoriously and abominably translated the word *γυνή*, by "*wife*," instead of *woman*. What will you think of my opponent's ignorance or honesty, when I tell you that in his own Bible the same word is *seven times translated WIFE* in *one* chapter?

MR. FRENCH.—[Aloud.] Where?

REV. J. CUMMING.—In the Douay Bible.

MR. FRENCH.—Ah! but where? In what part?

REV. J. CUMMING.—In the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. v. ver. 33, (Douay Bible). "Let every one of you in particular love his *wife* as himself."

My opponent must either read more, or speak less at random. The very same word, you observe, which we have in our version so "abominably" translated *wife*, is so translated in his own Scriptures; but it is not "abominable" when the Church of Rome does it. Again, we have it, (Ephes. v. 23; Douay),

"The husband is the head of the wife."

Verse 24, "So also let their wives be to their husbands."

Again, verse 25, "Husbands, love your wives."

What a disastrous reference! A wife in our version is also "venerable." In the Roman Catholic, she is "lovely."

Is it "abominable" to translate *γυνή*, *wife*? Then does the Church of Rome suffer justly, but cruelly, from her champion.

MR. FRENCH.—[Contemptuously.] Pshaw! I *admit* it!—[Moving vexatiously.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—Oh! I will make you admit a few more specimens presently. [Laughter.] Now, mark—[turning to the audience]—what I say. Do not go away with a wrong impression? He has complained that we have translated *γυνή* by *wife*, instead of *woman*. I, therefore, go to the production of his own translators, and I find that in one chapter, in the course of *seven* successive texts, *they* translate it *wife*, and not *woman*. I ask, then, Who are to be saddled with the epithets "abominable" "mistranslation," after such unfair and disingenuous exhibitions as these? In the next place, you will remember he quoted Jeremiah, xvii. 9—"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" and he complained most bitterly of this (the Protestant) translation. Now, I have minutely examined the original, and here I give it to you. I have referred to the Hebrew word, and the lexicon of Gesenius; and though I am not a *splendid* Hebrew scholar, yet I can refer to it with the aid of a lexicon very well. Now, the translation which Gesenius gives under the Hebrew word *שָׂדֵה* "*to be dangerously sick, malignant, incurable*."

The Italian version is *insanabile*.

The Spanish, *impenetrabile*.

The French, *desesperement malin*.

The German *ergrunden*.

All more or less according with ours. The only defect in our version is, that "desperately wicked" is not strong enough.

But how will you marvel when I tell you that the very same word, *Anash*, which he complains we have translated "desperately wicked," to favour Calvinism, his *own* version, in chapter xv. and verse 18, has translated "desperate, so as to refuse to be healed!" [Surprise.] Is my opponent honest, or is he ignorant? He complains bitterly that we have translated the original Hebrew word *Anash* "desperately wicked," and yet his own translators, in Jeremiah xv. 18, translate the very same Hebrew word "desperate, so as to refuse to be healed." Why translate honestly when an historical fact is in question, but with gross dishonesty when a doctrine is involved? It is well that the Pope takes a nap, and, during this "*otium cum dignitate*," betrays his fallibility. The pure Scriptures speak the doctrines of Protestantism, and they must be drugged before they help the popedom.

The next remark of my learned antagonist was on the impropriety of "CANNOT," for "do not," in a passage which I need not read; it is 1 Cor. vii. 9; "do not" is literal, but "cannot" is the meaning. When, however, we go to a parallel passage where "cannot" occurs, we find that "cannot" is the just and appropriate meaning, and "do not" the literal, but unidiomatic and absurd. For instance, Matthew xix. 11: "But he said unto them, All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given."—(Douay.) In our translation it is,

All men *cannot* receive this saying, save they to whom it is given."

The question is, whether of the two is, not the most literal, but the most faithful rendering; for every one acquainted with ancient languages must know that a verbatim rendering is not always correct: Which, then, is the real meaning? I read in the Douay version, at the end of the twelfth and next verse, "He that can take, let him take;" thereby explaining the meaning of the former verse to be "All men cannot," and not "do not;" implying evidently that there are some who can, and others who cannot: and if there is any meaning in the passage at all, "all do not" means "all cannot," because the reason why a man does not a thing he wishes to do, must be that he cannot do it.

Again, I refer to another passage (Gal. v. 17), where the same thing occurs: "So that," it is in our version, "they *cannot* do the things that they would;" in the Douay it is, "So that you do not the things that you would." Now, you will observe, that in our version it is, "ye cannot do;" in this (Douay) version it is "do not." Now, if I *will* to do a thing, the reason why I *do not* do it must be that I *cannot* do it; because two things are requisite to action: first, the *will*, or volition, secondly, the *power*. Now, if I have *volition*, or the *will*, but do not do the thing, the natural inference is that I have not the power; and therefore our translators have faithfully given you the *meaning of the passage*; and the Douay translators, as in the passage which he quoted last evening, have given you a sort of literalism which ends in absolute nonsense or mystification. Now I have replied to all his objections to our version; and if he bring for-

ward a dozen more of the same ridiculous and puerile description, I will reply to them. And what a splendid demonstration do they form of the excellency of our version! Whilst the cavillings of my opponent are supported by the outward parade of artificial objection, and by the use of subtlety and sophism, they appear to be substantial and tenable; but they show that they are paltry and pitiful shadows, the moment you come to analyse them; they evaporate into thin air, and disappear as if touched by the spear of Ithuriel, leaving our version untouched and untarnished in all its unassailable integrity. But having defended our own version, suppose I make a little inroad upon his, in order to show what he has to boast of. I refer you, in the first place, to Genesis iii. 15 (Douay version):—"I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: SHE shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel."

This verse is quoted in Roman Catholic documents, in order to prove the propriety of the hyperdoulia worship of the Virgin Mary. If rightly rendered in the Douay, it would not prove their practice, or in any way palliate the worship of the Virgin Mary.

The Hebrew feminine is *Hia*, (היא) masculine *Hu*, (הוא) and as a neuter it is rendered *it*. What confirms this is the fact that, in the Septuagint, the Greek is *Αὐτὴς* (*he*), referring to *Christ*; and yet my opponent most disingenuously tried to translate the word *SHE*, when the Greek and Hebrew (both in the masculine) stand by and silently but simultaneously protest against the corruption which he and his Church conspire to perpetrate. I refer to Ephesians v. 32, where we translate the apostle's

description of marriage: "This is a great *mystery*." But this the Church of Rome translates, "This is a great *sacrament*." Recollect, marriage is *one* of the "*seven sacraments*" of the Church of Rome, and there was a necessity for a proof. In this particular place (Ephesians v. 32) she has therefore translated the word *μυστήριον*, *sacrament*; but in twenty-seven other places where it occurs, she has translated it, without exception, *mystery*. Now, I ask, Why in twenty-seven passages it is translated *mystery*, and only when it refers to *marriage* it is rendered *sacrament*? The answer is, Because the Church had an end in view, namely, to exalt matrimony into the rank and dignity of a sacrament; and if she can compass this, she is not scrupulous about the means.

Again, the Gospel of Luke (chap. i. 28), the Church of Rome has translated the Greek word, "Hail, Mary, full of grace;" but in the Epistle to the Ephesians (chapter i. 6) she has translated the same word, "whom he has graced or favoured in the beloved." Now, why call it "full of grace" when applied to Mary, but "much favoured" as applied to believers, or "much graced," a more diluted expression? Why call it "full of grace" in reference to Mary, but "much graced" in reference to believers? Because there was need of buttressing and propping up the hyperdoulia, or worship of the Virgin Mary.

Again, (Douay version) Heb. xi. 21: "By faith, Jacob, when he was a-dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod." Now, in the Greek it is "adored or worshipped (ἐπὶ) upon the top of his staff or rod," leaning upon it—a totally different thing; and yet the Church of Rome finds

it convenient to call it "adored the top of his rod," in order to sanction the propriety of giving worship to images. Then again, Psalm xcix. 5, they have translated "worship *his* footstool," the original of which is לָהֻדוֹם, *Lahudom*, worship *at*, or *before*, or *in the presence* of his footstool. Again, the expression μετανοήσατε means "repent ye" in the Greek, translated in the Vulgate by "*agite penitentiam*," and wilfully and absurdly, "*do penance*" in the Roman version. But in certain passages where "*penance*" would be too gross, μετανοία is translated "*repentance*," and only in certain passages, where it is practicable, is it rendered *penance*. For instance, Acts ii. 38, "*Do penance*;" but in Acts iii. 19, "*Be penitent, and be converted*;" and Acts v. 31, "*A Prince and a Saviour to give repentance*."

My learned antagonist is classical scholar enough to know that *agere vitam* means "to live," *agere otium* "to enjoy retirement;" while the literal classical rendering or translation would be nonsense, and intolerable save in monkeries and nunneries; and, in the same way, *agere penitentiam*, means "to repent." But with an inconsistency too gross to be concealed in certain passages, they must render it "*do penance*;" while in another, where this rendering would be absolute nonsense, they translate it "*repent*." Again, to show you the misquotations which are made by my antagonist: he said that our version had rendered ἐπίλυσις, "*of private interpretation*," and that this was wholly inaccurate. I would only beg leave, my Roman Catholic friends, to say that it is the same in his and your own version.

MR. FRENCH.—[Earnestly.]—I do not deny it. I did not blame it at all.—[Turning to Mr. Cumming.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—[Deliberately.]—Oh, very well! This must have been one of your poetic flights, not to be measured by prose critics.

But I will conclude the whole of this matter at once: If my antagonist meddles with our Scriptures again—I mean the authorized version of our Bible—I am not only prepared to defend every point he attacks, but also to make no inconsiderable inroads on his Romish translation, grossly perverted in many passages; and show him how he may bitterly repent his temerity, or live to deplore the day when he "*strained at a gnat*," and the while was in the habit of "*swallowing a camel*." [Laughter.] But I now specially address myself to my Roman Catholic friends. With the exception of those gross mistranslations which I have brought forward, and with the exception of the Apocrypha, which was never acknowledged by the Catholic Church, and is no more inspired Scripture than the Waverley Novels, take the two versions (for I know Mr. French and your priests wish to drive you from the Bible in any shape, lest the light of truth should penetrate the darkness that envelopes you), take the Douay version on the one hand, and the Protestant version on the other, and you will find that they substantially agree in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred; read over the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, where justification by faith in the blood of Christ Jesus is proclaimed in all its purity and power; compare your version of it with ours, and you will find in ninety-nine-and-a-half cases out of a hundred they coincide substantially, and frequently verbatim. I therefore call on you to remember the fact, that if our version is an "*abominable mistranslation*," as my antagonist has represented it to be,

it equally tells against your own, because, if ours is abominable, yours, mainly and substantially agreeing with it, must be "abominable" also; and the result of such unfounded and unwarranted assertions will be, what my antagonist seems delighted to expedite, that the ignorant infidel will rejoice, and the careless and nominal Christian will have a pretext for his folly. "Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph." Mr. French's real object, as far as can be gathered from his words (for I pretend not to search his heart) has been to drive away, under ridiculous pretences, Roman Catholics from reading the Scriptures; and by his assertions—I must call them most unwarranted assumptions and assertions—to induce a belief that we have a mutilated Bible and a corrupt Rule of Faith. If such has been his object, I hesitate not to tell him that it is altogether unworthy of an honourable opponent. He is sure to be exposed, and not only with his creed gain nothing, but his character will lose much.

I have battered his Rule of Faith till it trembles on the verge of ruin, and he has no help but to endeavour to shake our translation, as he cannot shake our Rule of Faith. I am really sorry my time is so short; but you will recollect my learned antagonist entered upon the missionary achievements of the Church of Rome. He stated that the Church of Rome was almost the *only missionary church*, and that that proved her to have the *right* Rule of Faith, and to be the true Church. Now, mark you, a missionary Church is one which obeys Christ's command, "Go and teach all nations, and lo! I am with you always, even unto the

end of the world;" but, moreover, "*teaching them all things, whatsoever I command you.*" Now, mark these words: but if his Church has been teaching *purgatory*, saint-worship, and the mass; if his Church was teaching transubstantiation, and the hyperdoularian worship of the Virgin Mary, then the missionary efforts of his Church are more like the odious features of the great Apocalyptic apostasy, than the missionary Church of Christ preaching the Gospel to every nation under heaven.

He then asserted that we have made no great missionary exertions. Now, in the first place, during the Middle Ages we were literally crushed, and the light and force of truth almost extinguished and suppressed. In the next place, after the Reformation, the Reformers were busy in keeping off the aggressions and iron despotism of the Roman Catholic Church, and, therefore, in their efforts to maintain the truth at home, had no time to send the Gospel to the heathen. But now that the light of liberty and unsuppressed freedom has once more broken brilliantly over our land—now that they have power to preach and opportunity to act, we find that the Church Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, the Wesleyan Missionary Society, the Baptist Missionary Society, the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, the Scottish Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland Missions, have come forth and shown themselves, the moment the incubus of Rome's domination was removed; and, from the auspicious hour of her freedom and her uncorrupted faith, the Church of God has "looked forth, bright as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners." [Sensation]. But again, I contend that (so-called) missionary success

proves *nothing*. The scribes and Pharisees "compassed sea and land" to make one convert, and when they had found one, they made him ten times more the child of hell than before. We know also that the Mahometans made gigantic efforts to spread their delusions over the world, and therefore, mere effort or mere successful proselytism, however wide-spread, does not prove a church or a sect to be true. You may have read of priests who have endured martyrdom with the crucifix in their hands, but such martyrdom is no proof of truth, for such death is emulated by the savage Hindoo wife, who submits to be burned, a willing martyr, on her husband's funeral-pile. It is well known that the Mahometan devotee will submit to privations the most arduous, and to stripes and lacerations the most galling, to tortures more intense than Jesuit priest ever met—to privations more severe than we have any notion of, in order to make converts to his faith, under the inspiring but fallacious expectation of hereafter, for his reward, entering into a paradise reserved for the faithful, where (as he imagines) there is one round of perpetual enjoyment, and where life and beauty are alike immortal. I contend, therefore, in conclusion, that mere *success* in proselytism is *no* evidence, *no* criterion of *truth*. The Roman Church may be the most successful proselytizer, and may, notwithstanding, rival only more closely the speed, and victories, and features of Satan.

[The reverend gentleman's time here terminated.]

MR. FRENCH.—I never felt more at a loss to know what course to steer than at the present moment. I entered this room totally unencumbered with any thing like pre-

paratory matter. I had no papers arranged, of which my friend sometimes complains.—[Some movement at the extremity of the room, whereupon the learned gentleman paused, and John Kendal, Esq., Catholic chairman, rose to order.] The learned gentleman then resumed as follows:—I have entered the room this evening with the intention, at least, of following him step by step, in order, if possible, to avoid the reproach which I so frequently and so justly urge against him, and which, in return, with mimic accuracy, I have so often received from him, of "wandering" from the subject. I cannot, however, be guilty of much deviation from the subject in hand if I follow him so closely as I intend to do. The learned gentleman began by reading some copious extracts from Dean Milner. I shall merely advert to these. I have not time to dwell much upon them, but I shall refer to the first page I have opened, in order to show how inconsistently my learned opponent reasons, and how inconsistently Dean Milner reasons, on the subjects relating to CATHOLICITY, though he states many historical facts, in an unprotestant—that is, in an *unperverting* manner. My learned opponent complains that I quoted only those extracts from Dean Milner which I considered subservient to my purpose; and he thinks it rather extraordinary that I did not entertain you on the last evening when we met, with all the declamation against our "superstition," and with all the calumny which he, Dean Milner, utters against our saints; and that I did not mis-spend my time by reading to you those passages where Dean Milner lays down his opinion that the Pope is antichrist; and that I did not point out the particular period when popes became, or might

be denominated, Antichrist. We scorn all such calumny, whether it proceeds from Dean Milner or from theologians of the present day. I know *where* to look for Antichrist perfectly accordant with the description given of Antichrist by Scripture. But I shall not at the present moment insult the feelings of any one present by saying where that gigantic form of predicted iniquity rears its towering head. I have it in my own imagination. I know where to look for it, and though I have often heard the Church of Rome called "the lady of Babylon, dressed in scarlet"—[*simpering*]
—there is another great scarlet object carrying impiety and wickedness into every region of the globe, the head of which church is clothed in scarlet—a correspondence, in my idea, much nearer the accuracy of the description found in the Bible than any which my learned friend can give of the popes of Rome. In the very first page which he opened of Milner, my learned opponent read the following words:—

"Scarce a luminary" (speaking of the fourth century) "of godliness existed; and it is not common in any age for a great work of the Spirit of God to be exhibited, but under the conduct of some remarkable saints, pastors, and reformers."
—*Milner, Hist. of the Church*, p. 204.

Now, I shall content myself with this one solitary passage this evening.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[Turning to Mr. French.]—Go on! Will you read the next sentence, if you please?

Mr. FRENCH.—You have read it once: why should I read it again?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[Reiterating.]—Read the next, if you please; it is very short.

Mr. FRENCH.—[Complying.]—The next sentence is: "This whole

period, as well as the whole scene of persecution, is very barren of such characters—namely, saints, pastors, and reformers."—*Ib.* 204.

I am very glad, indeed—[turning to Mr. Cumming, and smiling]
—you adverted to it, for it just corroborates my argument.—[A laugh.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[Laughing.] Oh, very well; you are quite welcome.

Mr. FRENCH.—Now, gentlemen, this is the fourth century; and an age more fruitful in saints, pastors, and splendid martyrs is not to be found in the whole calendar of the Church of God. It is impossible for any one conversant with ecclesiastical history, as my learned friend is, to find more crowded traces of sanctity to be met with in any age during the persecution of Dioclesian. Even Dean Milner himself, only about ten lines above the place which my learned friend, in his sagacity, singled out in order to throw obloquy on the Church of Rome—even Dean Milner himself will corroborate my assertion; and I shall beg to direct you and my learned opponent to but ten or twelve lines on the same page, a little higher. He says:—

"Afterwards the master of the mines coming thither, as if by an imperial rescript, divided the sufferers into classes. Some he ordered to dwell in Cyprus, others in Libanus; the rest he dispersed and harassed with various drudgeries in different parts of Palestine. *Four he singled out for the examination of the military commander, who burnt them to death. Sylvanus, a bishop of great piety; John, an Egyptian; and thirty-seven others,* were the same day beheaded by order of Maximin."—*Id.* p. 204.

Now, my friends, this is the age which my learned opponent wishes to call your attention to, as being

remarkably barren in genuine piety and sanctity; whereas it is one in which every Catholic glories, as the model for all succeeding ages for martyrs and for missionaries, teaching them how to live, to suffer, and die in the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who is there, I again say, deeply versed in ecclesiastical history, that has not indelibly imprinted on his memory the sanguinary, the exquisitely cruel persecutions suffered by martyrs during the reign of the wicked and abominable Dioclesian? But, gentlemen, before I lay this book out of my hand, there is a short passage which I wish to lay before you, of much more importance than any thing which my learned friend, in his sophistical train of reasoning, has thought proper to present to you this evening. You are well aware of the difference between our Rule of Faith and the Rule of Faith which my learned friend threw so ostentatiously down on the table the last time I had the honour of meeting him, when he said in such a pompous strain:—"I know not where Mr. French's Rule of Faith is, but there is mine," suiting the action to the word, and throwing down the Bible. Now, gentlemen, I am acting on the defensive, and I am obliged to *try*, but it is totally impossible, to *answer* the lengthening string of accusations he has brought against us. I shall take them one by one, and give the best answer which I can; and if time should fail me, let him not upbraid me in the end for leaving any thing unanswered. But, gentlemen, I wish to put *him* on the defensive. I wish to impose upon him the *onus probandi*; I wish my learned opponent to prove to this assembly, *how it is that the Bible comes to be your Rule of Faith? to prove the authenticity of the Bible*; and—(I am going to

astonish my learned friend not a little)—*I deny the authenticity of that Bible.* [The audience seemed surprised at this statement, made as it was *abstractedly*.] I think I shall put my learned friend's ingenuity considerably "on the rack" this evening, for, *argumentandi causa*, I say, I deny the authenticity of the Bible. Be not satisfied, my friends, when my learned antagonist comes to illustrate a point—be not satisfied, I beseech of you, if you seek to be profited,—when he points out text upon text, be not satisfied with every gaudy flourish of rhetoric, and every enthusiastic exclamation, when laid before you on certain texts, in which he indulges in his style of "oriental" diction. No, my friends, listen to sound and serious argument. Let my learned friend tell you satisfactorily how he knows these books to be inspired. Let him not say, Here is John, Here is Paul, and Here is Peter; that is not the way to prove it. I must have some solid and convincing proof that these books were written by inspired evangelists—some *solid* internal proofs; and when he has done that, he will have obtained, perhaps, an object for which he has expressed a great anxiety and a great desire—viz. if he rejects tradition, and can prove it without, I have no objection to step over to his religion. In the mean time, as I take tradition to be the ground of the rule by which the world has been Christianized, and the Bible to be but a *part* of that sacred tradition, I shall adhere to my plan. I believe in the Bible, because the great CHURCH fostered it in her sacred bosom from age to age, and tells me undeniably that it is so. I know no other test. It is impossible for the learned gentleman to have the effrontery to assert, that if your Protestant brethren

were unacquainted with the actual books of the Bible, and if they were all suddenly presented to you in company with fifty other books, holy books, that may be put with them, written in ancient times—it is impossible, I say, for him to assert that you would all come to the same conclusion, and, by the same natural induction, know the Bible from the rest, and point to this as genuine, and throw away that as apocryphal. If you could find any two men in this audience to do so, then I would say, let us have it for our Rule of Faith. But it is totally impossible, and I throw down the gauntlet of defiance to my learned antagonist, or to any other man on earth, to prove to me that it is capable of being done. Only let a jury of twelve men sit down deliberately, and would they all come to the same conclusion? Would they all say, Here is inspiration, and here it is not? Would they say the Song of Solomon bears evident marks of inspiration? and when they come to passages which, translated into English—and I must speak the truth, however improper it may be to allude to them—but passages in your version of the Testament which savour of obscenity in their English garb, though not in the original one; without the testimony of the Church, to the effect that these passages are inspired, what twelve men would come to the conclusion that they are inspired? No: it is wholly impossible. Whereas, in rejecting tradition, the Bible falls to the ground, there is then no Bible in existence. “*Evangelio ipsi non crederem*,” says St. Augustine, in the fourth century; “I would not believe in the Bible itself, unless induced to it by the authority of the Catholic Church.” There is the test, the *only* test; and the moment the learned gentleman

rejects that test, he is a mere idle conjecturer as to what book is apostolical, and apocryphal, and what is not so. To show you, my friends, that, at least, I am speaking the language of antiquity, that I am not falling into the fantastic vice of this age of modernism—namely, an incurable *penchant* for dogmatizing for myself—I shall read to you a passage from Dean Milner. He is talking of Irenæus, who is called by the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius “a successor of the apostles.” He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist. Speaking of Irenæus, he says, “He makes a strong use,” says Milner, “of the argument of tradition in support of the apostolical doctrine against the novel heresies. His acquaintance with the primitive Christians justified him in pressing this argument. The force of it, in a certain degree, is obvious, though the Papists have perverted his declarations in favour of their own Church. But what may not men pervert and abuse? The reasonable use of tradition, as a collateral proof of Christian doctrines, is not hence invalidated. What he observes here concerning the barbarous nations is remarkable. ‘If there were any doubt concerning the least article, ought we not to have recourse to the most ancient churches where the apostles lived? What if the apostles had left us no writings whatever? ought we not to follow the tradition which they left with those to whom they committed the care of the churches? It is what several barbarous nations do, who believe in Jesus without paper or ink, having the doctrine of salvation written on their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and faithfully keeping up to ancient tradition concerning one God the Creator and his Son Jesus Christ. Those who have received

this faith without Scripture are barbarians, as to their manner of speaking, compared with us; but as to their sentiments and behaviour, they are very wise and very acceptable to God; and they persevere in the practice of justice and charity. And if any one should preach to them in their language what the heretics have invented, they would immediately stop their ears and flee far off, and would not even hear those blasphemies.'

"Thus, it appears, that to the illiterate barbarians, tradition, though a poor substitute, supplied the place of the written word. We may not, however, suppose that their faith was blind and implicit. Our author gives a strong testimony to their godliness; and those of them who were taught indeed of God would have in themselves the strongest and most reasonable of all proofs of the divinity of their religion. This is a valuable evidence of the Holy Spirit's influences, and of the native energy of Divine truth on the hearts and lives of very illiterate men."—Mark—you see I read every thing fairly—what he says against us; you see he reasons with all the feebleness of my learned friend when he has no solid ground to go upon.

And mark, this very Irenæus, in another passage, which I have not before me, but which I quote *memoriter*, talking of the Church of Rome, says: "Ad hanc ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam"—that is, "To this Church of Rome must every other church appeal."

And this same Irenæus points out an occasion where the Pope of Rome was appealed to, and where he excommunicated a certain church in Asia for not obeying him—[Whispering on and around the platform,]—but he goes on to say, and this is a very remarkable passage

[looking at the audience]—demanding great silence while it is read.—[Silence being restored, the learned gentleman read the passage in a very measured and impressive manner. After which he exclaimed—]

Just so is it! The Catholic in the present day who is illiterate, but well-grounded in his religion, if he were to meet the learned gentleman in a stage-coach, and if he (the learned gentleman) were to endeavour to reason him out of his religion, he would pause and shut his ears and say to him, "I am not learned enough to dispute with you, but I am learned in the doctrines of my religion; I believe in the sacred traditions of the Church: I leave you to the enjoyment of your learning; leave me to the enjoyment of my religion." But you see here most evidently, gentlemen, that in ancient times (and that is all that this dispute was instituted for, to prove whether my or his religion be the ancient one,)—and I think you must by this time be thoroughly satisfied that my religion accords with primitive antiquity, and that his is "the offspring of modern enlightenment," to use his own expression upon one occasion. For you may possibly remember (I think it was on the second or third day of the disputation) my reverend friend maintained in a most solemn manner, that, instead of having pure Christianity the nearer you approached the days of Christ—that, instead of a true knowledge of Scripture, and a knowledge of pure and unadulterated Christianity increasing, that it was more likely to be in its acmé now than the full light of learning, philosophy and science had burst in upon the world, than it was in days immediately succeeding the apostles! Now, my friends, I shall quote another passage or two from Irenæus.

St. Irenæus, L.C. "The Church extended to the boundaries of the earth, received her faith from the apostles and their disciples. Having received it, she carefully retains it, as if dwelling in one house, as possessing one soul and heart: *the same faith she delivers and teaches with one accord*, and as if gifted with one tongue: for though in the world there be various modes of speech, the tradition of doctrine is one and the same. In the churches of Germany, in those of Spain and Gaul, in those of the East, of Egypt and of Africa, and in the middle regions, is the same belief, the same teaching. For, as the world is enlightened by one sun, so does the preaching of one faith enlighten all men that are willing to come to the knowledge of truth. Nor among the pastors of the Church, does he that is eloquent deliver other doctrine; for no one is above his master; nor he that is weak in speech diminish the truth of tradition. Faith being one, cannot be affected by the powers or the want of utterance."—*Adversus Hæreses*: l. i. c. x. p. 48, 49.

"God placed in his Church apostles, prophets, doctors; and the whole operation of the Spirit, of which they do not partake who are not united to the Church; but by their own bad designs and actions they deprive themselves of life. For where the Church is, *there is the Spirit of God*; and where this Spirit is, there is the Church and all grace: *the Spirit is truth*."—*Ibid.* l. iii. c. xxiv. p. 223. *Vide* l. iv. c. xxxiii. p. 272.

St. Irenæus, L.C. "The apostolic faith, manifested to the whole world, they who would behold truth may see in every Church; and we can enumerate those bishops who were appointed by the apostles and their successors, down to ourselves;

none of whom taught, or even knew, the wild opinion of these men (heretics.) Had the apostles really possessed any secret doctrines, which the *perfect* only were to hear, surely they would have communicated them to those to whom they entrusted their churches. However, as it would be tedious to enumerate the whole list of successions, I shall confine myself to that of Rome, the greatest, most ancient, and most illustrious church, founded by the glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; receiving from them her doctrine, which was announced to all men, and which, through the succession of her bishops, is come down to us. Thus we confound all those, who, through evil designs, or vainglory, or perverseness, teach what they ought not. For to this Church, *on account of its superior headship*, every other must have recourse—that is, the faithful of all countries; in which Church has been preserved the doctrine delivered by the apostles. They, therefore, having founded and instructed this Church, committed the administration thereof to Linus. Of this Linus Paul makes mention in his Epistle to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacleetus; then, in the third place, Clement, who had himself seen and conversed with those apostles, at which time their preaching yet sounded in his ears. Nor was this alone true of him: many at that time were living whom they had taught. To Clement succeeded Evaristus; to him Alexander; and then the sixth from the apostles, Sixtus; who was followed by Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus. But Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherias, the twelfth from the apostles, now governs the Church. By the same order and succession has the doc-

trine delivered by the apostles in the Church, as the preaching of truth descended to us; and the proof is most clear that it is one and the same vivifying faith, which, coming from the apostles, is at this time maintained and taught."

Adv. Hær. l. iii. c. iii. p. 175.

"So also Polycarp, instructed by the apostles, and having conversed with many who had seen the Lord, was appointed by them bishop of Smyrna. Him we knew in our youth. The doctrine which he had learned from the apostles he uniformly taught and delivered to his Church: and this doctrine alone is true. To this all the churches of Asia, and they who have succeeded to Polycarp, bear testimony. Surely he was a witness of the truth, more credible and more faithful than Valentinus, and Marcion, and others of the like perverse opinions." *Ib.* p. 178.—"Things being thus made plain, it is not from others that the truth is to be sought, which may be readily learned from the Church. For to this Church, as in a rich depository, the apostles committed whatever is of Divine truth, that each one, if so inclined, might thence draw the drink of life. This is the way to life; all other teachers must be shunned as thieves and robbers. For what? Should there be any dispute on a point of so small moment? must not recourse be had to the most ancient churches, where the apostles resided, and from them collect the truth? And, had these apostles left us nothing in writing, must not we then have followed that rule of doctrine which they delivered to those to whom they entrusted their churches? To this rule many barbarous nations submit who, deprived of the aid of letters, have the words of salvation written on their hearts, and carefully guard the doctrine which has been delivered."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—The page, if you please.

Mr. FRENCH.—Page 178, c. iv. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1710.

Now together with these views of truth, in addition to them, you see in Scripture this doctrine; yes, although I quote the fathers of the Church, you shall see it all corroborated by Scripture. "Therefore, brethren"—it is 2 Thess. ii. 15, [turning to Mr. Cumming,] "stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle."

What I contended, therefore, gentlemen, the last time I had the honour of meeting you here, and what I still most strenuously maintain is, that the mode by which all nations were converted to Christianity was by tradition. My learned friend has quoted a passage from St. Chrysostom to prove that the Bible had had an extensive spread over the nations of the earth; but he forgot to tell you that the nations of the earth could not *read* the Bible. Surely my learned friend might have informed you that it could be only in the "polished corners" of the earth, and among the more enlightened of the nations, that these fountains of Divine truth were accessible, and even there, my learned friend must have known, that manuscripts before the art of printing were extremely difficult to purchase, and exceedingly rare, and were very few in number compared with the religious advantages of the age.

But why, I ask my friend, does he make such a masquerade of this matter? why does he keep this subject so studiously out of view? How, I ask him, could our barbarous and benighted ancestors, "plunged in deep and damnable idolatry," how could they ameliorate idolatry by the diffusion of the Bible,

or by any other modes of conveying Divine light to the people, excepting through the medium of oral instruction? My friend must know that, when St. Augustine came over to this country, our barbarous ancestors were totally unacquainted with the use of letters. He must know likewise that what facilitated the great conquest of the kingdom of God in the conversion of Great Britain was the peculiar sanctity which distinguished the character of its first enlighteners. I shall at present—(but here I have such a long list of notes, that I scarcely know which to take first.) But on the last evening, my learned friend, after having thrown down the Bible, in the manner which I have depicted to you, on the table, said, “*There is my Rule of Faith*; we must all have recourse to the oracles of God if we wish to work out our salvation; the most illiterate can comprehend it; it is within reach of every one’s understanding.” I ask then, if this be so, What need of so many parsons [laughter]—so many clergymen in England to inculcate the truths contained in the Bible? What need of this grand hierarchy yept the Church of England, built up on the model of the Church of Rome—which Church of England is at the present moment tottering to its very basis? What need, I repeat, of any spiritual instructor, if the Bible is to speak one plain, uniform, intelligible language to every understanding? How is it to be the Rule of Faith, if persons come to conclusions so widely different the one from the other in fundamental points of salvation? Can that be a Rule of Faith where one man rejects baptism as totally unnecessary, and where another declares that unless you are baptized with water you can never

enter the kingdom of heaven; where one man says that Christ Jesus our blessed Lord is God and man, and where another declares that he is merely man and not the Son of God?

I know very well that my learned friend will probably here say, “I do not admit the Unitarian to be a Christian;” but I am not obliged to listen to such explanation on the part of my learned friend. If the Unitarian be not a Christian, it is in consequence of that prerogative with which my learned friend gratuitously invests him—namely, the right of interpreting the Bible for himself, spurning the authority of the Church of Ages, which teaches us that Christ is both God and man. It is utterly useless for my friend to tell me the Unitarian is not sincere and Christian. What! proscribe all the Unitarians in England; men of splendid and commanding genius; men of conscience and honour; men of integrity and truth; men who live and die—die actually with the persuasion that Christ is mere man, and “Intercessor”—who believe in God most firmly! Is it just, is it honourable to say they are not *Christians*, when it is his very system, the system which he himself recommends, that has caused their unchristianization? Oh, it is really unfair! it is decidedly unkind, ungenerous, and unfair on the part of my learned friend, or on the part of any clergyman of the Church of England or Scotland. Surely, if we are to take texts of Scripture and “mangle” them in that way in which my learned friend mangles his texts, the Unitarian has a great deal to say for himself. “My Father is *greater* than I”—he reasons that in your ears incessantly, continually. Again, “Him *the Father* hath raised up and showed him openly.” Why, the Unitarian

exclaims, I see most plainly that Christ could not *raise himself*. It is "the Father," the God of heaven, who raised him, and not his own power that resided within him. He comes, therefore, to the conclusion that Christ is not God; and he comes to it by that very Rule of Faith which my learned friend so ostentatiously threw upon the table. So certain, my friends, is it, that the moment you quit the traditions of the CATHOLIC CHURCH, that you have no anchor whereon to rest, but become "tossed about by every wind of doctrine." Now if I am not proceeding in consecutive order, no blame is attributable to me, for the next note I have upon my paper is connected with I know not what. But I have taken it down. It is, "There is none righteous, no not one." If I recollect rightly, this was in reference to Purgatory. It appears here in the abstract; but even in his interpretation of that point I can bring another passage to overturn it, where two holy persons are described in Luke, as "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." Now here is a flat contradiction. The one says, "There is none righteous, no not one," and yet here are two persons "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord *blameless*." *Who* is to be the reconciler of these two apparently discordant, inharmonious passages? The *Church of God*—the *Church of Ages*, which teaches uniformly in every age the self-same doctrine! Every Catholic reconciles it at first sight; the Catholic knows that "a good man sins daily," and, therefore, he explains this passage without any reference to his priest. This passage is truly perplexing to my learned friend, and all his sophistry this evening will not be able to

throw light upon the subject. He says in one place, "There is none righteous, no, not one;" that is, there is none totally exempt from all stain of venial sin; "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless," means they are polluted with nothing like mortal sin. Thus it is reconciled immediately to sense, grammar, and logic; and none of the rules either of Scripture or propriety are violated. But in the gloomy system which lays down that *all* sin is "damnable," and that a man can be saved by faith alone—the suffering believer cannot be lost, if his faith be firm, whatever may be the enormity of his crime—in this case there is a repugnance never to be reconciled.

My learned friend next alluded to the Sextine edition of the Bible, and demanded an explanation of various discrepancies, amounting, as my friend said, to about two thousand, I think—[the learned gentleman appearing to doubt his own correctness.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[Turning to him, in affirmation, said]—Yes! two thousand.

Mr. FRENCH.—Very well! Why, my friends—[the learned gentleman continued]—there is no difficulty in understanding that! There were several heretical translations of the Bible in circulation at the time, and the pope of the day thought proper to produce a Bible which should be totally free from gross corruptions. But mark! that pope never pretended that any council would ever take upon itself to give an accurate translation of the Bible. Little slips and inadvertences will take place, and they do here, and my friend acknowledges it is so in the English Bible translated by Calvin; and in all languages there will be little inadvertences. But what I

complain of—and he cannot retort the reproach back upon me—what I complain of is the *wicked, malignant, deliberate perversions* of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, for no other purpose than that of propping up their own guilty schism and indefensible heresy. That is what I complain of to my friend, and I have proved to my learned friend that he is not able to extricate himself from the embarrassment. When I proved to my learned friend, some evenings ago, that the translators of the English Bible, in order to do away with communion in one kind, instead of translating it, “He that shall eat *or* drink the blood of the Lord unworthily,” &c. in the English Bible had translated it, “He that eats *AND* drinks the blood of the Lord unworthily,”—when I called upon him to know whether that was not a mistranslation, he could not deny it. But at our next meeting my friend came in armed with all the learning of the British Museum, and stated he had inspected two manuscripts. He found one of the Copts—*heretics*, mark!—reproached of old for having perverted the Bible, and the other an Alexandrian copy of the Bible. Well, it is a known fact that the English translators of the Bible never *saw* either of them. It is a known fact, that in the first edition of the Bible printed that they had actually, as it is in our Bible, the word *or* (*η*), and that they wantonly, deliberately, and wickedly imposed upon the British public by changing it into (*και*) *and*.

Again, as to that passage I brought before you the other day, I brought a man profoundly conversant in the Hebrew language to prove my position, that the words, “desperately wicked” were foisted in for an iniquitous purpose. How has my learned friend endeavoured

to explain it away this day! Why did not my learned friend do it when the Hebraist was present to confute him? He (the Hebraist) has looked at this over and over again, and he says he never saw in his life a more wanton mistranslation than that very passage. Here is my Hebrew Bible—[taking up the same, and opening it], with the literal translation under it, word for word, in Latin. Let my learned friend recur to it, and see if he can make out the words “desperately wicked” by it.—[The learned gentleman here consigned the book to John Kendal, Esq., Catholic chairman, saying:—“Hand it over to Mr. Cumming, if you please.” Which having been done by George Finch, Esq., and nothing ensuing thereupon, the learned gentleman continued.] Then my friend said—“My learned opponent called your attention to a passage from St. Chrysostom, in which he attempted to prove that the nations of the world were kept supplied with Bibles, and employed themselves in ‘philosophizing’ on them.”—[Laughter.]—Now really it does require a little more candour on the part of my learned friend in translating from the Greek. The words he read were these:—“But they are in the habit of philosophizing from the Scripture with one mind.”

Now I must call the attention of my learned friend to the word “philosophizing” in Greek. Though we derive our word “philosophizing” from it, it has no meaning analogous to the English word “philosophizing.” The Greek of “philosophizing” is badly translated in the English. It means “*deriving wisdom from*,” and that does not mean philosophizing, because philosophizing, in the English language, is very different to the meaning of *philosophizo*, which is the Greek. It

means to "derive wisdom from it," and that, my friends, is all that St. Chrysostom meant in saying, "And with one mind they *derived wisdom* from the Scriptures;" which proves most clearly that there could be no other church then in existence but the Catholic Church, because they derived wisdom from it *with one mind*. The moment you introduce, on the contrary, the Rule of Faith laid down by my friend, every man is taught to interpret for himself, and it is an utter impossibility that they should "*philosophize with one mind*," because no person will come to the same deduction.

My learned friend then calls my attention to King James's Bible, who appointed so many learned men to attend the translation of it. And why did he do it?—Because you are told that the Bible which was in use among the common people was so full of corruptions. Therefore, gentlemen, when the grand Catholic Church was at an end in this country, it appears King James thought proper to give a better translation of the Bible, in consequence of the innumerable gross mistranslations that defiled it in Protestant translations before that period. What a Rule of Faith, I again say, must that have been! and what a Rule of Faith is that Bible in which, even if you could prove its *authenticity*, in which there are such innumerable mistranslations! My learned friend then, in his usual happy manner, in referring to our authors (though I thought he had been "sickened" by the ineffable disdain with which I replied to Dupin), brought forward Dr. Geddes, as a man who lavished many praises on the English translation of the Bible. I have the pleasure to tell my learned friend that "he is a weed," (though I do not like to speak ill of the dead)

"which I heartily and most readily throw over into his garden."—[Laughter.] Dr. Geddes was branded as a heretic while he lived; we rejected him from our communion, and have no respect for his memory now that he is dead. Then comes the learned gentleman's long and elaborate defence of the iniquitous translations of the Bible, which I pointed out to you, where Paul says, "Cannot I take about with me a woman, as the other apostles?" And as my friend endeavoured to perplex your understandings and minds, I shall endeavour to render everything extremely clear to you, and to show you that no fault, no odium whatever, falls on our Catholic translation of the Bible. Certainly the word means, originally, "woman." It is applied to the blessed mother of our Saviour. The Saviour says *woman*, which there means *mother*. In other places it means wife. We all know that. But mark, my friends, it means likewise woman, and by us Catholics and Protestants alike it is translated *woman* in several books of the Bible. We all agree except upon one unfortunate passage, where they happened to know—and in that the depth of their cunning and their guilt consists—where they happened, I say, to know that it means simply woman, and not *wife*, since St. Paul himself tells us that *he* was *unmarried*. 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8:—"For I would that all men were even *as I myself*. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that. I say, therefore, to the *unmarried* and widows, it is good for them if they abide *even as I*." They, the Protestant translators, knew, therefore, that St. Paul meant not to allude to a wife, he telling us with his own mouth that he had none; and yet, notwithstanding this their

knowledge of his unmarried state, notwithstanding the ancient translation of the Latin Vulgate before their eyes translating it accurately *woman*, they had the incredible audacity to translate it into English, to their deeply-branded and eternal infamy, in the following manner:—1 Cor. ix. 5: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, *a wife*, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" where the apostle most evidently means, according to the confession of many Protestant divines, those devout women who, after the manner of Jewry, served the preacher with necessaries, of which kind many followed Christ, and sustained him and his followers with their substance. Oh! is not this, my Protestant friends, too bad—ay, is it not too deliberately courting the maledictions imprecated in the sacred volume upon the head of him who shall thus deal treacherously in corrupting its genuine meaning, and causing thousands, if not millions, to stumble? My friends, the Protestant Bible alone furnishes me with an adequate expression to characterize such indefensible, such unqualified villany—namely, by calling it—a perversion of the sacred text,—most "*desperately wicked*." And now, my friends, after this exposition of your *Parliamentary* Bible, come we to another, where St. Paul says, "It is better to marry than to burn; but if they *do not contain*, let them marry;" but the Protestant has inserted, "if they *cannot*." I told you the word *cannot* was *ου δυναται* ("if they cannot contain.") Now, if it were "*cannot*," it would be this long word, *δυναται*. I ask my learned friend, Is it so—viz. *ου δυναται*? No, he will tell me, it is not there. My friend will perhaps say it is paraphrastical, but I do not want

paraphrasts of the Bible; I want real solid translation, and I say that no man can commit such an enormity without bringing down upon himself the curse pronounced upon the profaners of the sacred word of God.

Let my learned friend show something like this in our Sextine Bible, instead of "the little slips and errors of mortality." But let him not think I will permit him to creep out of the difficulty into which he has plunged upon such easy terms. No, my friend must bring *solid, ponderous argument*, not shallow and superficial sophistry! Again, my friend alludes to the word *ἐπιλυσεως*. He labours under a mistake here, voluntary or involuntary. He imagines that I upbraided the English Bible for translating it "interpretation." I did not. But I merely wished to point out to my friend that it was a much stronger word; that it meant "disentanglement;" for he knows very well that ours is translated in the same way with his own. And I am going to advert to another where your translation agrees more or less with our own, but still I maintain that they are both wrong; that is, that they do not come up to the strength and forcible power of the original. It is where Christ said, investing Peter with his grand primacy, *ποιμαίνε τα πρόβατα μου*. He says this to no other apostle, but only to Peter. This strong expressive Greek word means, "*Shepherd thou*," or "*shepherdize*, my sheep." The grand commission, therefore, the plenitude of authority thus given by Christ to Peter, runs thus: "Feed my lambs." "*Shepherdize my sheep*." "Feed my sheep." (John xxi. 15, 16, 17.) But the English translation enfeebls the middle verse by a tautology which our Saviour never uttered,

rendering it *feed*, instead of *shepherdize*.

My learned friend has used an expression which certainly does not savour of "the milk of Christian charity." He says of our missionaries who went into every part of the world shedding their blood in the cause of our adorable Redeemer, that the fruit of all their labours was but to make their converts but "ten times more the children of hell than they were before." Oh, my friends, is this language which ought to distil from the lips of a Christian minister? I ask my friend whether he is in the habit of reflecting deeply before he speaks, or whether he pours forth a mere torrent of words which he neither knows how to check nor to direct? Surely, no Christian minister of any sect in this room can smile with approbation on such virulence of language used towards their Catholic brethren! What! does the learned gentleman mean to say that Fenelon, St. Francis Xavier, St. Francis of Sales, Massillon, Bossuet, and all the great luminaries of the Catholic Church, were "children of hell?" I know that Calvin would call them so, just as he calls every one who differs with him as to creed. But my friend professes to be a Calvinist and yet totally unconnected with Calvin, which is indeed a most extraordinary paradox. The next kind epithet bestowed on the Catholic religion is, that it was "a dark and tremendous *apostasy*." My learned friend knows that we reproach them with that, from the beginning of their secession to the present day. "They went out from us;" we did not apostatize from the Protestant Church. I proved to you from the beginning that our ancestors planted the Catholic religion in every region in Europe, and that in the sixteenth century

your different sects impiously sundered from us; you "went out of us;" you found out a religion for yourselves. You took up the Bible as your Rule of Faith; and you still call it the Rule of Faith, instead of holding with our Rule of Faith. It is not one Rule of Faith: or, if so, how happens it that your sects are diametrically opposed to each other? They are variable rules; and no year passes in this country but it produces a new religion with a new Rule of Faith.

My friend alluded next to certain priests in the vicinity of the Humber, who were unacquainted with Latin. These men may be well-taught men, thoroughly acquainted with the traditions of the apostles and the Church; but the grave charge brought against them is that they were unacquainted with Latin, and received the Gospel orally and traditionally, and not by the Bible.

But there is not time to answer all the notes which I have taken from my learned friend's speech. I wish to throw the *onus probandi* on him this evening. I wish my learned friend, in a clear, lucid manner, to inform us by what test he can prove the authenticity of that Bible on which he prides himself, and which he calls his Rule of Faith. I shall listen very attentively to him, reminding him that I expect argument, and not flashes of oratory. I wish him rather to take for his guide and model the close reasoning of Aristotle or of Lord Bacon, instead of the mode of reasoning so familiar to my learned friend, not of Demosthenes, or Cicero, but rather of the sophist Libanius.

Again, though I have proved to you so satisfactorily that the fathers are all unanimous on the grand fundamental articles of the Catholic

faith, again he repeats, that they are all "at variance with one another." Upon what, I ask, are they at variance?—Why, merely on the same points that my Catholic friends on the right hand and the left are when they consult the Bible on various passages of unimportance, and deduce from it, as my friend does, one one meaning, and another another. And so have the fathers done; but no father, however great, could be called any thing but a heretic, who did not agree upon the fundamental articles of the Catholic faith. What is this, my friends—I am sorry to use the expression, but my friend may retort it if he likes, and call me a sophist—but what is it but mere shadowy sophistry, an attempt speciously to darken and perplex a point of the greatest simplicity, by asserting that the fathers do not agree with one another? When I have opened their volumes, I have proved to you their most unanimous consent and concurrence upon every thing vital in the Catholic religion.

Again, I call on my friend to exonerate Protestants from the charge of daring impiety, in keeping the Sabbath on Sunday. What texts of Scripture has he brought to corroborate or sanction his doctrine? Why, merely one:—"I was in the Spirit on the *Lord's day*." What is that, my friends? "The Lord's day" is the day of Jehovah. That is all I deduce from it; there must be one Lord's day, and it is commanded most specifically to be kept, and it had been kept for ages. There must be something more substantial to overturn the dogma than such an ambiguous expression as that. If my friend intends to prove his Rule of Faith, let him first prove the manner of keeping the Lord's day from Friday to

Saturday evening? These are essential things! Let my friend prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; let him prove the consubstantiality, co-essentiality, of the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost. This is the burden I place upon the shoulders of my friend; and if oratory can effect the desired object, you will have it in abundance this evening. But let us have argument. I am tired of the rhetorician *giving goodly words*, I call for the logician. My friend has to prove the inspiration of that book. He has to prove that it is true which his Church asserts, though upon our authority; for he knows well that several books now termed canonical were the subjects of long debate and disputation in the Catholic Church for several ages. I find that the Epistle to the Hebrews was doubted in the seventh century by some persons; and as to Revelations, there is not a learned man among Protestants that has written within a century past, who has not doubted the authenticity of that book. But, wiping all that out of the question, the grand burden I place upon the shoulders of my learned friend this evening, is to prove intrinsically the canonicity of that very book, the Bible, which he calls, and is proud so to call, his Rule of Faith—which he calls "his pride and his glory."

Again, I ask my learned friend, How is it, if God meant to instruct mankind by the New Testament, how is it that so many have been lost? how is it that so many of the ancient Testaments have been lost? Did our blessed Saviour command his disciples to write out a Rule of Faith? did he point out any text in which he told them to do it?

This, my friends, is a Quaker who is speaking—a converted Quaker.

[The expiration of the usual hour being announced by the chairman, the learned gentleman concluded abruptly by saying]—This is written by a Quaker, a convert within this month past.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I demand, my Christian hearers, your most sincere sorrow over the painful spectacle which my antagonist has this evening presented before you. You will observe that he felt most justly and most deeply that the ground on which he stood at the outset had been taken from beneath his feet—he felt that if he tried to retain it longer he would be hurled from it without mercy or help—that if he tried to keep the position of a Roman Catholic he had not an inch to stand on; and now what, under such circumstances, has he had recourse to, do you think, in order to prop up the exploded principles which he professes to hold? Why, he now presents himself before you, hypothetically in theory, but truly in fact, in the garb of an *infidel*, as he has by turns in the blasphemous robes of a *Socinian*, and occasionally arrayed in the so-called spiritualities of a Quaker. He *dare* not meet me as a Roman Catholic: he must stand before you in the position of an infidel; he must forsake his own ground—he has practically this evening abjured his own Church—he has committed an act of ecclesiastical suicide, and must now stand before you an unblushing and undisguised infidel. If my learned opponent be *really* a Roman Catholic, I will meet him *as* a Roman Catholic; if an infidel, I will meet him in that character too. When I entered on this discussion, I presumed that he was what he professed himself to be, and what the countenance of the several and suc-

cessive priests, who have night after night accompanied him, showed him to be; but now he renounces the Papal faith, he takes the ground of a sceptic, denies the Bible, and calls upon me to prove the truth of Scripture, the canonicity of its successive books, and the accuracy of the authorized translation; and having thus disburdened himself, having thus cast off the Roman Catholic Church—its creeds and its remnants of Christianity yet unextinguished—and stood on the yet more degrading and ignominious ground of an infidel,—he, erst the Romanist, arrayed now in the polluted garments of Tom Paine, proclaims infidelity in any of its shapes to be right, and Christianity in all its forms to be wrong! [Sensation—we understand Mr. French looked surprised in the meantime.] Monstrous resource! dreadful superstition! painful alternative! requiring a man to extinguish all semblances and lights of any Christianity in his creed and heart, and to abandon all claim even to the shattered and flimsy superstition which bears the name of Christ, before he can meet and confront his adversary, and demonstrate PROTESTANTISM to be wrong, and Roman Catholicism to be right! This is my greatest and most decisive victory. This is Mr. French's honest admission—that his creed is indefensible. It really "speaks volumes" in behalf of the omnipotence of our cause. His conduct to-night, I say, speaks volumes—it tells you in piercing and impressive tones that the Papal faith, even in my opponent's estimate, has not one inch of ground whereon to repose its hopes of victory, and that his and its only and last chance of escape from utter ruin is to run for shelter to the subtleties of the infidel. My opponent invoked the patronage of the Arian,

then he adopted the views of the Quaker, and last of all, in order that he may have something to say, he must run to the ruins of scepticism for stones to hurl against the fortress of impregnable, unscathed, and Scriptural Protestantism. [Sensation.] For, observe, every argument with which he set out required *this*: every stone which he dares to throw at me has *to be taken out of his own citadel*. He cannot touch me and keep his own ground *intact*. This he felt he dare not do; this he cannot do. He must take his stand on the ruins of the Roman Catholic Church before he can so much as *touch* the Protestant Church, or take away one particle of its claim, one fragment from the indefeasible positions with which I guarded it, and on which I based the hoary claims of our pure and primeval Christianity! He must commit ecclesiastical, or papal, or moral suicide, in order that, by the atrocious deed, he may defend an atrocious superstition. He now stands before you a proof that Popery has no shadow of decent apology. My antagonist, notwithstanding his demands, complained that I was so anxious to have three nights or four for the discussion of this topic, and that he wished to terminate the subject in one or two nights. But you will notice that he has called on me, along with this plea for brevity, to prove the canonicity of Genesis, then of Deuteronomy, then of Leviticus, then of Exodus, then of Numbers—to prove the canonicity of Joshua, then the Song of Solomon, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Gospels and Epistles—[a whispering at Mr. French's part of the platform, which was thus explained to Mr. Cumming by]:—

GEORGE FINCH, Esq., P.C. He says "All in a lump."

Mr. CUMMING.—Oh! He asks

me, for my convenience, to prove them "all in a lump"—even this would require twice two nights. [A laugh.] But is not this audience aware that I gave a specimen in my opening address, and at the outset of this discussion on the Rule of Faith, of the *evidences of Christianity*, and thereby the *practicability* at least of proving the truth of Scripture without the Church of Rome? I showed it can be done—that it is practicable. Why repeat it? Does he wish that time should be expended merely in repeating proofs that I have reiterated over and over again, and entering at length into an argument which it would take weeks to finish? Rome allows the Scriptures to be part of the Rule of Faith; the difference is, that we hold them to be *all*. I can destroy two-thirds of his rule. Mine he dare not assail. That surely cannot be the straightforward course of an antagonist of open and honourable convictions: it must be a manœuvre to get out of the position in which he has hitherto been standing, and to stir up a side-fight with an infidel in order that the Church of Rome may escape in the turmoil. While he wears the cloak of the infidel, and leads me to attack infidelity, he knows the Church of Rome will enjoy a respite: my opponent is wise in his way. Suppose, (without entering on the arguments by which Christianity is proved,) suppose that Mr. French declares himself at once an infidel, *then*, if he will wish to renew the discussion on that footing, I will come night after night to prove Christianity to be true. Come as an infidel or as a Romanist, and not both alternately as it suits. But [taking up two books and opening them]—here are two admirable volumes containing an Abstract of the Evidences of Christianity. Now,

instead of entering on the argument myself, I will read a brief recapitulation of the arguments on the evidences of Christianity, perfectly sufficient to show that such proof is practicable, and that we are not indebted for one jot of our evidence to the traditions or infallibility of the Papal Church. The existence of the Western Apostasy is proof of the truth of the prophecies, but this is extorted, not spontaneous. The Rev. Hartwell Horne thus sums up the evidences of the inspiration of our Rule of Faith :—

“No nation in the world can be more certain of the genuineness and authenticity of any of their public acts and records, which have been preserved with the utmost care, than we are of the genuineness and authenticity of the writings called the Scriptures, which are now in our hands. For, in the first place, the manner in which they have been transmitted to us resembles that in which other genuine books and true histories have been conveyed down to posterity, and the most acute adversaries of the Scriptures have never been able to invalidate or disprove the fact of their being transmitted so to us.

“*Secondly.* The language and style of writing, both in the Old and New Testaments, are such as prove them to have been composed at the time and by the persons to whom they are ascribed, and, consequently, that they are both genuine and authentic.

“*Thirdly.* Such a multitude of minutely particular circumstances of time, place, persons, as mentioned in the books of the Old and New Testaments, as afford a clear and unquestionable proof of their genuineness and authenticity. No forged or false accounts of things superabound thus in pecu-

liarities; in fact, no forger would mention so great a number of particulars, since this would be to put into the reader's hands so many criteria by which to detect him. Nor could any forger or relater of falsehoods produce such minute details.

“*Fourthly.* The moral impossibility of the books of the Old and New Testaments being forgeries is an additional evidence of their genuineness and authenticity, for it is impossible to establish forged writings as authentic in any place where there are persons strongly inclined and well qualified to detect the fraud. If the books of the Old Testament be forgeries, they must have been invented either by Gentiles, Jews, or Christians. By the *Gentiles* they could not have been invented, because they were alike ignorant of the history and sacred rites of the Hebrews, who would never have given their approbation to writings invented by them. It is equally certain that they are not the fabrications of the Jews, because they contain various difficult precepts and laws, and also relate all the idolatries and crimes of that people, and the severe punishments inflicted on them by God. Now all these creditable facts would not be comprised in those books if they had been invented by the Jews.

“And the Christians could not have forged the books of the Old Testament, because these were extant long before the Christian name had any existence. Equally impossible is it that the books of the New Testament could have been forged; for the Jews were the most violent enemies of Christianity: they put its Founder to death; and both Jews and Gentiles persecuted his disciples with implacable fury, and they were anxious to stifle the

new religion in its birth. If the writings of the New Testament had been forged, would not the Jews have detected the imposture? Is there a single instance on record where a few individuals have imposed a history upon the world against the testimony of a whole nation? Would the inhabitants of Palestine have received the Gospels, if they had not had sufficient evidence that Jesus Christ really appeared amongst them, and performed the miracles ascribed to him? Or would the churches at Rome or at Corinth have acknowledged the epistles addressed to them as the genuine works of St. Paul, if he had never preached among them? Or supposing any impostor to have attempted the invention and distribution of writings under his name, or the names of the other apostles, is it possible that they could have been received without contradiction in all the Christian communities of the three several quarters of the globe? We might as well attempt to prove that the history of the Reformation is the invention of historians, and that no revolution happened in Great Britain during the seventeenth century, or in France during the eighteenth century, and the last twenty years.

“3rd. But have the books of the Old and New Testaments been transmitted to us entire and uninterrupted? We answer in the affirmative, and upon evidence the most satisfactory that can possibly be required. For, if they had been corrupted, such corrections must have been introduced either by Christians or by Jews. First, with regard to the Old Testament, the silence of the Jews (who would would not fail to have noticed the attempt if it had been made) is a clear proof that it was never corrupted by the Christians. And if

the Jews had either mutilated or corrupted their writings, they would have expunged whatever militated against the character or honour of their nation; but the silence of the prophets before the time of Christ and his apostles fully proves that no obliteration or corruption had then been attempted. The constant reading of their sacred books in public and in private (which were at once the Rule of their Faith and of their political constitution), and the numerous copies both of the original as well as of the Septuagint Version, together with the numerous sects and parties into which the Jews were divided after their canon was closed, and the reverence of every party for their law, all concur to render any attempt at falsification improbable and impossible before the time of Christ; and, after that event, the same books being in the hands of the Christians, these would instantly have detected the malice and fraud of the Jews, if they had endeavoured to accomplish such a design. Equally satisfactory is the evidence for the integrity and incorruptness of the New Testament. For the contents of its several books are precisely the same now as they were in the first two centuries: to which fact we may add, that the multiplication of copies, which were read both in public and in private, the reverence of the Christians for these writings, the silence of their acutest enemies, who would most assuredly have charged them with the attempt if it had been made, and the agreement of all the manuscripts and versions extant, are all so many proofs of the integrity and incorruptness of the New Testament; which are further attested by the agreement with it of all the quotations from it which occur in the writings of Christians from the

earliest age to the present times. It is true that certain books are cited or referred to in the Old and New Testaments, which are not now extant; but an examination in detail of those books (which does not admit of abridgment) has shown that none of the genuine or canonical books of Scripture have been lost.

“ 4th. Not less satisfactory is the evidence for the credibility of the writers of the books of the Old and New Testaments. For, in the first place, they were so many in number, and lived at such a distance of time and place from each other, that if they had been impostors (which their disinterestedness, integrity and impartiality prove them not to have been) it would have been impracticable for them to contrive and carry on a forgery without being detected. And as they neither would nor could deceive the world, so they neither could nor would be deceived themselves. Every page, indeed, of these books proves that the writers of them had a perfect knowledge of the subjects which they have recorded; and their moral character, through rigidly tried, was never impeached by their keenest opponents. Secondly. If there had been any falsehood in the accounts of such transactions as were generally known, they would have been easily detected: for these accounts were published among the people who witnessed the events related by the historians, and who would easily have detected fraud or falsehood, if any such there had been, but who did not attempt to question either the reality of the facts or the fidelity of the narrators. The credibility of the authors of the Old and New Testaments is further attested by the principal facts contained in them being confirmed by certain ordinances or monuments of great celebrity, which were insti-

tuted among Jews and Christians for the purpose of commemorating particular facts or events in their respective histories at the very time when these events took place, and which have subsisted from that time to the present day, wherever either Jews or Christians are to be found; but which ordinances most assuredly would not have been thus observed in commemoration of fictitious events. To this consideration we may add, that the wonderful establishment and propagation of Christianity is a most convincing proof of the entire credibility of the New Testament, and of the religion which it establishes; which was spread far and wide by the force of truth that accompanied the preaching of the Gospel, and which has continued to spread, even to the present time, notwithstanding all the persecutions and oppositions which it has experienced from its numerous, powerful, and most bitter enemies. Nothing, indeed, but the plainest matter of fact could induce so many thousands of prejudiced and persecuting Jews to embrace the humiliating and self-denying doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, which they held in such detestation and abhorrence. Nor could any thing but the clearest evidence, arising from undoubted truth, make multitudes of lawless and luxurious heathens receive, follow, and transmit to posterity, the doctrines and writings of the apostles, especially at a time when the vanity of their pretensions to miracles and to the gift of tongues could be so easily discovered if they had been impostors—at a time when the profession of Christianity exposed persons of all ranks and ages to the greatest contempt and to the most imminent danger. Further, an additional testimony is furnished to the credibility, truth,

and genuineness of the Scriptures by their agreement with the profane history, both natural and civil, and by the existence of various coins, medals, and ancient marbles, which attest the reality and truth of many of the facts therein recorded. In short, no history in the world is confirmed by such various and concurrent testimonies as that related in the Bible.

“ 5th. Moreover, that the Scriptures are not merely entitled to be received as credible, but also as containing the revealed will of God,—in other words, that they are divinely inspired—we have evidence of various kinds, amounting to moral demonstration. For their sacred origin is evinced by the most illustrious attestations, viz. miracles and prophesying, which carry with them the most manifest proofs of a Divine interposition, and which it cannot reasonably be supposed that the Almighty would ever give, or permit to be given, to an imposture. The miracles were instantaneously and publicly performed before multitudes, both friendly and hostile to the persons by whom they were wrought; they were sensible and easy to be observed. Memorials were instituted at the time many of them were performed, which continue to be observed to the present time; a manifest proof this of the reality of those miracles, which the bitterest enemies of the Gospel who witnessed them could never gainsay or deny, though they faintly attempted to evade them. The prophecies, also, were delivered, during a long succession of ages, by persons who lived at different and distant times; they were so numerous, so particular, both with respect to nations and individuals, so opposite, and apparently so irreconcilable, that no human wisdom could have devised them, no human

power could accomplish them. Many of the predictions which are found in the Old Testament foretold unexpected changes in the distribution of earthly power. And whether they announced the fall of flourishing cities, or the ruin of mighty empires, the event has minutely corresponded with the prediction. To mention a few instances: Nineveh is so completely destroyed that its site is not and cannot be proved; Babylon is made a ‘desolation for ever, a possession for the bittern, and pools of water;’ Tyre, all voyagers and travellers concert in stating, is become ‘like the top of a rock, a place for fishers to spread their nets upon;’ and Egypt is ‘a base kingdom, the basest of the kingdoms,’ and still tributary and subject to strangers. But the great object of the prophecies of the Old Testament is the redemption of mankind.

“ This, as soon as Adam’s fall had made it necessary, the mercy of God was pleased to foretel. And, as the time for its accomplishment drew near, the predictions concerning it gradually became so clear, that almost every circumstance in the life and character of the most extraordinary personage that ever appeared among men, was most distinctly foretold. The connexion of the predictions belonging to the Messiah with those which are confined to the Jewish people, give additional force to the argument from prophecy; affording a strong proof of the intimate union which subsists between the two dispensate laws of Moses and Jesus Christ, and equally precluding the artful pretensions of human imposture and the daring opposition of human power. The plan of prophecy was so wisely constituted, that the passions and prejudices of the Jews, instead of frustrating, ful

filled it, and rendered the person whom they regarded the suffering and crucified Saviour who had been promised. It is worthy of remark, that most of these predictions were delivered nearly, and some of them more than, three thousand years ago. Any one of them is sufficient to indicate a prescience more than human; but the collective force of all taken together is such, that nothing more can be necessary to prove the interposition of Omniscience than the establishment of their authenticity; and this, even at so remote a period as the present, as we have already seen, is placed beyond all doubt.

"Besides these external attestations, the Scriptures have the most excellent internal characters of truth and goodness, which prove their Divine origin and inspiration, in the sublimity, excellence, and sanctity of the doctrines and moral precepts which they deliver, and their admirable adaptation to the actual state and wants of mankind; in the harmony and connexion that subsist between all the parts of which they consist; in their wonderful preservation, notwithstanding all the attempts which were made by their enemies to destroy them; and finally, in their admirable tendency (which is demonstrated by its effects wherever the Scriptures are cordially and sincerely believed), to promote the glory of God and the good of mankind, and the course of righteousness and virtue in the world; and to prepare men for a life of faith and holy obedience upon earth, for the eternal enjoyment of God in heaven. To which we may add, the infinite superiority, in every respect, of the Christian revelation over every other religion which has ever been in the world.

"Upon the whole, we have such a number of evidences of the truth

of the Scriptures, as no man can resist who duly and emphatically considers them: and it is to the wilful ignorance of those evidences that we are to ascribe that infidelity which at present exists in different parts of the world.

"*Sixthly.* 'The Bible,' as a late eminent prelate has justly remarked, 'is not a plan of religion delineated with minute accuracy to instruct men as in something altogether new, or to excite a vain admiration and applause; but it is somewhat unspeakably more great and noble, comprehending in the grandest and most magnificent order, along with every essential of that plan, the various dispensations of God to mankind, from the formation of this earth to the consummation of all things.'

"*Other* books may afford us much entertainment and much instruction, may gratify our curiosity, may delight our imagination, may improve our understandings, may calm our passions, may exalt our sentiments, may even improve our heart; but they have not, they cannot have, that authority in what they affirm, in what they require, in what they promise and threaten, which the Scriptures have. There is a peculiar weight and energy in *them*, which is not to be found in any other writings. Their denunciations are more awful, their convictions are stronger, their consolations more powerful, their counsels more authentic, their warnings more alarming, their expostulations more penetrating. There are passages in them throughout so sublime, so pathetic, so full of such energy and force upon the heart and conscience, yet without the least appearance of labour and study for that purpose; indeed, the design of the whole is so noble, so well united to the sad condition of human kind; the morals have in them such purity and dig-

nity, the doctrines, so many of them above reason, yet so perfectly reconcilable with it; the expression is so majestic, yet familiarized with such easy simplicity, that the more we read and study these writings with *pious dispositions and judicious attention*, the more we shall feel the hand of God in them. Thus far are the Scriptures the only Rule of Faith and standard of our lives; and thus do they point out to us the only way by which to attain solid comfort, peace, and happiness. But that which stamps upon them the highest value, that which renders them, strictly speaking, *inestimable*, and distinguishes them from all other books in the world, is this,—that they, and they only, contain *the words of eternal life*. In this respect, every other book, even the noblest compositions of man, must fail; they cannot give us that which we most want, and what is of infinitely more importance to us than all other things put together—eternal life.

“This we must look for nowhere but in the Scriptures. It is there, and there only, that we are informed, from authority, of the immortality of the soul, of a general resurrection from the dead, of a future judgment, of a state of eternal happiness to the good and eternal misery to the bad. It is there we are made acquainted with the fall of our first parents from a state of innocence and happiness, with the guilt, corruption and misery which this sad event brought on all their posterity; which, together with their own personal and voluntary transgressions, rendered them obnoxious to God’s severest punishments. But, to our inexpressible comfort, we are further told in this divine book, that God is full of mercy, compassion and goodness; that he is not extreme to mark what is done amiss;

that he willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn away from his wickedness, and save his soul alive. In pity, therefore, to mankind, he was pleased to adopt a measure which should at once satisfy his justice, show his extreme abhorrence of sin, make a sufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world, and release all who accepted the terms proposed to them from the punishment they had deserved. This was nothing less than the death of his Son Jesus Christ, whom he sent into our world to take our nature upon him, to teach us a most holy, pure, and benevolent religion, to reform us both by his precept and example, and lastly to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification. By him and his evangelists and apostles we are assured, that, if we sincerely repent of our sins and firmly believe in Him and his Gospel, we shall, for the sake of his sufferings and his righteousness, have all our transgressions forgiven and blotted out; shall be justified, that is, considered as innocent, in the sight of God; shall have the assistance of his Holy Spirit for our future conduct; and if we persevere to the end in a uniform (though, from the infirmity of our nature, imperfect) obedience to all the laws of Christ, we shall, through his merits, be rewarded with everlasting glory in the life to come. Thus do the holy Scriptures contain ‘all things necessary to salvation;’ so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or to be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”

I might enter upon more extensive and elaborate evidence; and if Mr. French will admit that he is a disbeliever in the inspiration of Scripture and the truth of Chris-

tianity, I will gladly meet him as an Infidel, and will treat him with arguments similar in tone and power, as an infidel, with which I have treated him as a professing Roman Catholic, (*turning to Mr. French, who began to smile*). But let it be distinctly observed, if we Protestants cannot ascertain the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of Scripture on our grounds, *much less* can a Roman Catholic on his grounds. There is a gross Jesuitical fallacy in the system of Romish reasoning on this point. It is all very pretty to talk about their sure foundation; but, mind you, if our foundation is frail, their foundation is equally so at least. My opponent says, You cannot know the Scriptures but by the Church; but pray *how does he know the Church?* He answers, and he *must* so answer, "By the Scriptures." Now what sort of reasoning is this? He knows the Scripture by the Church, and the Church by the Scripture; and is this logic?—is this a specimen of Aristotelian logic? Surely it is more like "orientalizing" in its amplest form, than the acute reasoning of Aristotle, to whom he has invited me as to a paragon of logic. If he says, we cannot know the Scriptures but by the Church, I ask, and I demand a reply, *How does he know the Church?* He must—I call on him to give a reply, when he rises, less ridiculous and childish than "By the Scripture." He reasons in a circle. To illustrate this—How do you know that A. is honest? B. says so. How do you know that B. is honest? A. says so. How do you know that both are honest? A. and B. both say so. This is a specimen of the bewildering nonsense palmed on Roman Catholics in the name of logic and religion. I ask my opponent what he believes: he believes

what the Church believes. If I ask what the Church believes, he answers, What I believe. Pray what do you both believe? We believe the same thing. My learned opponent very likely calls this reasoning. I call it nonsense; to believe which, argues weakness of intellect; and to stand in need of it, shows the wretched foundation on which the whole superstructure of Roman Catholicity depends. I now call on my antagonist to remember that he dare not touch his Rule of Faith, as he cannot find it till he has first proved by private judgment the truth of Christianity, next the inspiration of Scripture, next that the Church is to be infallible, and lastly, and the most difficult of all demonstrations, that the *Church of Rome* is that Church. My opponent quoted some passages from Dean Milner, where the historian speaks of the existence of some good men previous to the general corruptions of the times that succeeded the fourth century. Whilst I allow there were some good men in the worst of centuries, yet I feel that it is right to inform my opponent, that, even according to the admissions of the too credulous Milner, they were like "angel visits, few and far between." But I will quote also from Milner, and concerning the same age too. It will thus be seen that nothing short of a miracle, which was never promised, could have preserved a pure tradition while it came along wholly polluted channels:—

"Scarce a luminary of godliness existed; and it is not common in any age for a great work of the Spirit of God to be exhibited but under the conduct of some remarkable saints, pastors, and reformers. The whole period, as well as the whole scene of this persecution, is very barren of such characters; not but that many precious

children of God suffered in moral patience and charity, but those who suffered with a very different spirit found *no pastor to discountenance their self-will and false zeal*—a sure sign that the great spirit of martyrdom was very low compared with what had formerly been the case.” Milner adds, that about this time the pastors took care of the emperor’s horses, the council of Laodicea had to prohibit clergymen from visiting taverns, practising magic and enchantments; and, “on the whole,” adds Milner, “this council evidences a great and deep corruption to have taken place in the Church of Christ.” And to show you that this is not Milner’s opinion alone as to the corruptions of the fourth century, I read from Vincentius Lirinensis, sect. 4: “Also when the poison of the Arians had contaminated not a small portion but almost the whole world, so that a kind of darkness was suffused over the minds of almost all the Latin bishops, some of them being let in by fraud, what was to be followed by preference in so great a confusion?” Such were the channels of tradition—such the tainted corruptors of truth—such the men on whom Rome depends for all. Hence it appears that Arianism had infected almost all the Latin bishops, and this I rather suspect is the secret of my friend’s ready patronage of the Arians. [*A laugh.*]

He knows that his own Church, ere ripe in apostasy, was infected to the core with Arianism; and yet, in order to make out his point, he cries, “Shame on the man who would deny the name of Christians to those who would take the Sun of Righteousness from heaven, if they were able, and ‘quench his bright and saving beams in Erebus and thick night.’” He most mellifluously declares that it is very un-

charitable to deny that the men who degrade our Lord have any claim to Christian discipleship, or that they have any title to a place in the catalogue of saints. But it is of no avail; they have no title to Christianity; and he knows that at the Downside Discussion, at which a minister of the Gospel now present [Rev. Edward Tottenham of Bath, who was this evening present] took a part, it was admitted on both sides that Socinians were *not* Christians. He asked next about the traditions, and he referred to those which existed in the second and third centuries, and of which I speak. I am prepared to prove that the traditions which existed in the Christian world in the second and third centuries were those embodied in the Apostles’ Creed. Irenæus thus speaks:—

“For the Church, although she is extended throughout the universe even to the ends of the earth, received the faith from the apostles and their disciples; which faith is in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them. And in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who predicted the dispensations of God by the prophets, and the advent, and the generation from the Virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascent in the flesh into heaven, of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord, and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father to resume all things, and to raise the flesh of all mankind; so that, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, should bow to Jesus Christ, our Lord and God and Saviour and King, and every tongue

should confess him; and that he should judge all things in righteousness, and that he should consign to eternal fire the spiritual things of iniquity, and angels that have transgressed and apostatized, and the impious and unjust, and the blasphemers among men; and granting, on the other hand, life, and immortality, and eternal glory to the just and righteous, and to those who keep his commandments, and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance.

"2. And the Church, albeit she is scattered throughout the whole world, having received this preaching and this faith, diligently keeps it, as if she inhabited one house. And in like manner she believes in these things as having one soul and one heart, and she uniformly teaches them and hands them down as having one mouth. For although there are various languages in the world, yet the strength of tradition is one and the same. And neither do the churches that are founded in Germany believe or hand down otherwise; nor do the churches which are in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Lybia, or those which are established in the middle of the world. But as the sun, the creation of God, is one and the same in the whole world; so also the light, which is the preaching of truth, everywhere shines and enlightens all men who will come to the knowledge of the truth. And neither will he who is strong in speech enlarge it (for no one is above his master), nor will he who is weak in speech diminish it. For this faith being one, neither has he who can say much respecting it amplified it, nor has he who can say little curtailed it."—*Irenæus's 1st Book against Heresies*, ch. x. p. 50. (Bened. edit. printed at Paris, 1710.)

Again—and I might read another

confirmatory extract, only it would take me too much time—my opponent said, "If oral tradition be not necessary, what is the use of so many *parsons*?" Now he is here trying to mystify his own matter and your minds together, by endeavouring, in a very drivelling argument, to identify and to confound the *exposition* of the Bible with oral *tradition*, and with all the lying legends which have come down through contaminating and contaminated channels. We profoundly love the preaching of the Gospel. We hold the preaching of the Gospel to be an ordinance of God. We hold it to be the prosecution under Heaven's own seal of the commission, "Go and preach the Gospel; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Preaching from the Scriptures and according to the Scriptures is totally a different thing from propounding legendary traditions as additions or even contradictions to Scripture. We bring our preaching to the Scriptures; you, the Scriptures practically to your traditions. If an infidel ask me what is the ground whereon I base the great and saving doctrines of Christianity, I reply, "*The law and the testimony*"; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Again,—my opponent asked, in reference to the Arians and Socinians, Might I not deduce their doctrine by private judgment from the text which he quoted, viz. "My Father is greater than I?" Now, if I wished one text more decidedly Trinitarian than another, it is this very text; and if I wished one rather than any other to refute the Socinian sophist, it would be this. For, if Christ had been merely man, to say, "My Father is greater

than I," would have been the veriest truism that ever fell from the lips of a creature. It would have been inconsistent with the wonted and characteristic wisdom and judgment of Him, "who spake as never man spake," when he said, "My Father is greater than I." This very statement implied that he was more than man, and in *office* not in *nature* less than the Father; that, as God, he was equal to the Father; that, as man, he was in all points inferior to the Father, being like as we are, yet without sin. We admit with the Socinian, that if sin be excepted, there is not an attribute of our common humanity which may not be predicated of Christ; and therefore, all a Socinian can say of Christ we say of him also. But we go farther, and assert of Christ all that can be asserted of God—all of omniscience, omnipotence, and truth, and justice, and holiness, that constitute the splendours of that glory which is unapproachable and full of light. My opponent insists that I shall prove the Trinity, and the procession of the Holy Spirit. I answer, the Father is in Scripture called God, the Son is called God, and the Holy Ghost is called God. One signal proof of the last is in Peter's charging Ananias with lying to the Holy Ghost—"Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God,"—and yet the Bible says there is but one living and true God. If my opponent wishes for texts demonstrative of so obvious a tenet, I am ready; only there are mysteries he will find it impossible to clear. He next requires me to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit. This is soon done. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father." (John xv. 26.) He alleges the monstrous inference, that

Christ could not raise himself. My opponent is painfully ignorant of Scripture. "Destroy this temple," (referring to his own body, as he himself expresses it,) "and in three days *I will raise it up*." (John ii. 19.) Again—"What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." (John v. 19.) Arians, I repeat, are not Christians. They are infidels, arrayed in the outer vestments of Christianity. Again—my friend has told you a great deal about the translation of the word *γυνή*. Now I showed you that in his *own* translation of the Bible it was translated *wife*, and I told you that in our translation it was translated *wife* also; and I ask him whether the word be rightly translated in both our Bibles in the expression "Peter's *wife's* mother;" whether the evangelist means *wife*, and dares, in the face of your Church, to say that Peter was married? If so, the *first Pope*, so presumed, contrary to the belief of the Church of Rome, was a married man, and necessarily must have set a bad example to all the bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic communion. [Laughter.] Again—he refers to the words (and he dwelt a long time on them), "Feed my sheep;" and he added, most authoritatively, that this implied an infallible authority given to Peter superior to that possessed by all the rest of the apostles. Now, upon this point I go to the "glorious St. Augustine." I know my friend has cast him overboard at length, though he long hugged and cajoled him as "the splendid, the glorious Augustine;" but my present reference will remind my opponent of his first love, and though he in his passion cast him overboard once, he will no doubt take him to his bosom again. [A laugh.] Now I quote St. Augustine's certificate.

"I have said in a certain passage respecting the apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him as upon a rock. * * *

"But I know that I have frequently afterwards so expressed myself, that the phrase 'Upon this rock,' should be understood to be the rock which Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, Thou art Petra, but, Thou art Petrus, for the rock was Christ. Let the reader select which of these two opinions he deems the most probable."—*The first Book of his Retractions*, tom. i. p. 32.

Again—

"It appears in many passages of Scripture, that Peter represented the Church, and particularly in that place where it is said, 'I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

"For did Peter receive those keys, and did John and James and the other apostles not receive them?

"* * * What was given to him, was given to the Church. Therefore Peter represented the Church, and the Church was the body of Christ."—*Serm. 149, upon the words of 10th ch. of the Acts*, vol. v. p. 706.

Again—

"When it was said to him, 'Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep,' it was said to all."—*Upon the Christian Contest*, ch. xxx. tom. vi. p. 260. (Ed. as above.)

That is to say, the same authority which was delegated to Peter was delegated to the rest; and instead of there being a peculiar and exclusive supremacy conferred upon Peter, there was the same identical official power conferred on the rest of the apostles. And had I time to enter on the pretended supremacy of Peter, I should soon be able to show, from the word of God, that it is one of the most impossible points to establish. If Peter was at Rome, the text that is quoted to show it shows

that Rome is delineated in Rev. xviii. But what has feeding Christ's sheep to do with infallibility? Paul enjoined the Presbyters of Ephesus to feed their flocks: Were they, therefore infallible? Then my opponent followed up this with some curious remarks on two texts: "There is none righteous, no not one;" and again, as to two saints "walking in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless." I need not reply to these, so irrelevant to the topic under investigation. Every Protestant who understands his Bible, knows that the text, "There is none righteous, no not one," describes the *natural state* of mankind at large: "Righteous before God," or perfectly justified, "walking in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless," in the *eye of the Church and before the world*, is descriptive of the effect and reformation produced by the power of the Holy Spirit in the heart. But where is my opponent's Rule of Faith? He has long left it, as a hopeless thing. He quoted from St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, viz. holding the traditions; but when we refer to the apostle on his meaning, he gives an explanation, namely, the Second of Thessalonians, where he says, (chap. ii. 15,) "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." He refers them to truths he had spoken, and subsequently written, in a former epistle, commanding them to "hold the traditions," or ordinances, for this is the word. And we find another explanation on referring to the Acts of the Apostles, where St. Paul, in his missionary travels, comes to these same Thessalonians, to whom he addressed his epistle; and here we learn what the traditions were. "They came to Thessalonica, and Paul, as his manner was, went in with them, and three Sabbath

days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I speak unto you is Christ." (Acts xvii. 2.) The apostle, after this preaching at Thessalonica, writes his converts, "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, either by *word*, or by *our Epistle*." What were the traditions? We answer, Those embodied in his oral address and inscribed in his epistles. *Here* are the traditions. [Holding up a Bible.] He states them in the Acts of the Apostles. He expounds from the word of God the truths contained in it; and he moreover reminds them in his epistle to them to expound these things unto the people.

Now, then, having glanced at these points broached in the course of the statement of my antagonist, I repeat my challenge, that if he comes into this room as an infidel, and on infidel ground, I desire him to meet me in that character; but if he be a Roman Catholic, and is agreed that the Bible is inspired, I am not called on to prove it to be true, but only his traditions added to it to be false. He wants to bring in as sacred truths those traditions which have come down through the tainted and corrupted channels which I have described to you; whereas it is my object to show not only that their traditions are unnecessary, but also contradictory, unscriptural, and absurd. Keep in mind that the Catholic Church and the Church of Rome are not by any means the same; and that disjointed fragments from contradictory fathers prove nothing but the insuperable obstinacy of Romanists in clinging to a falling ruin; and you have an answer to half of my opponent's speech.

My opponent has frequently asserted, that we Protestants differ

from each other on fundamental points, and he attributed this diversity of opinion to our holding the Bible as the only Rule of Faith. First, I deny that we differ in essentials. Next, I call upon you to bear in mind that if *we* differ, it is as ever has been and will be. In the apostolic churches, mid the effulgence of apostolic preaching, there were also differences — *we* profess not to prevent them; but if there be differences in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, *she* is responsible for those diversities: and why?—Because she professes to present a *guarantee* against all diversities of sentiment in faith. I am prepared to show that the Church of Rome is one moral chaos—one tempestuous hell of conflicting tenets, crusted with a thin transparency of unity. He asked again and again, Where is your unanimity? after his exposition of the faith of the Quakers, the Socinians, the Irvingites, and Southcottians, and some other sects which he alleges to have sprung from Protestantism. While we are no more connected with Southcottians than with Pope Joan or Simon Stock the Stylite, let me add that, amid the noonday of inspiration, there were "one of Apollos, one of Cephas;" for we read in 1 Cor. xi. 19, "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." St. Paul predicts the appearance of "grievous wolves," and of that Apostasy which commands to abstain from meats and from marriage. If it be an argument now against us that heresies and schisms appear among us, claiming, as we all do, the same Rule of Faith, it must be an argument also, and applying with tenfold greater force against the primitive and apostolic Church, that heresies and divisions appeared among them.

If in the former case it told against the Rule of Faith *now*, it tells *à fortiori* against the Rule of Faith in the days of the apostles.

Again, I go to the primitive Church—allowing it to be primitive in the secondary sense in which my antagonist is pleased to take it—and there I find mention of a certain Arian heresy as being in existence; and so greatly, it appears, did it spread, and so much did it affect the Rule of Faith of my antagonist, that nearly all the ministers and bishops of the Church of Rome became deeply infected with it.

Again, I find St. Augustine—that celebrated friend and favourite father of my opponent—St. Augustine enumerates in his day more than *ninety-nine* (!) different heresies which appeared in the Christian world. Their names are here—I have a list of them here. There afterwards were the Waldensian, Piedmontese, and so on—and at a period, mind you, when the Roman Catholic Rule, according to my opponent, was in the ascendant. Thus, you will observe, looking at the heresies which spread during the exercise of this rule, we find even the glorious St. Augustine enumerates no less than ninety-nine at that one period.

And again,—the Roman Catholic Church holds out a special *guarantee* against the starting up of heresies within her. We read, nevertheless, of the Waldensian heresy, of the Vadois heresy, of the Piedmontese heresy of the thirteenth century, and at length we find our own reformers starting up out of the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church in the fifteenth century; while she still asserts that her Rule of Faith guarantees that there should be none. We find various heresies springing up, according to the testimony of Augustine, of history, and of that memorable Roman Catholic insti-

tute, the Inquisition. Thus the Roman Catholic Rule fails to prevent divisions also.

Fanaticism, the very spirit of fanaticism, appeared at a very early period in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. My antagonist will probably turn round and retort the charge upon us; but I would have you again observe this difference between the two:—*we* cast off and abjure fanaticism, whilst, if it springs up in the heart of the Roman Catholic Church, it is solemnly canonized and stamped. We have an instance of this in the case of Simon Stylites, who planted himself on the top of an enormous column, sixty feet in height, and remained in that position for thirty years, whilst pilgrimages were purposely made from all parts of India to witness the penances and inflictions of this fanatical devotee. We read of the Flagellants in the eleventh and twelfth centuries—a sect of men and women who went through the open street half-naked, and whipping themselves till the very blood ran down them—not reprobated but applauded at Rome [*excitement*], and regarded as the lovely offspring of my opponent's Rule of Faith. We read again of the Crusades, begun through the eloquence of Peter the Hermit, in which millions of military fanatics rushed to the rescue of the Holy Land, under the influence of one rampant spirit of terrible fanaticism—not to speak of the innumerable military fanatics, who all sprang into existence from the Roman Catholic Church, and under her Rule of Faith, which is held up to us as “infallible,” and which, moreover, guarantees that there should be no fanatical extravagance in the world, much less within the pale of her own communion. And thus you will observe, that in comparison of the innumerable instances

of fanaticism and schism which spring up within the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, the like instances of fanaticism amongst Protestants dwindle into nothing, and compose a mere handful.

Again,—not a few instances of infidelity have appeared under the very rule which he himself (Mr. French) declares to be the sovereign guarantee against all infidelity, fanaticism and error. France was deluged, in 1792, with such a torrent of infidelity, that she wrote upon the graves of her illustrious martyrs, “Death is an eternal sleep;” and, in that very Church which guarantees that there shall be *no* infidelity, no heresy or schism, one of her most distinguished bishops fell down and worshipped, with hundreds of the same faith, an infamous woman, set up by the offshoots of the Papacy, as the representation of the “Goddess of Reason.” And yet the Church of Rome, in face of successive proofs to the contrary, boasts of her Rule of Faith as an infallible recipe against all such heresies, and guarantees their impossibility. [Some whispering was here heard at the platform. The reverend gentleman, after a pause, then proceeded to say]—I am reminded that it was the Archbishop of Paris, who did so.

Mr. FRENCH [in surprise.] *The Archbishop of Paris!* [turning to the Rev. Mr. Cumming.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Yes! I repeat it—the *Archbishop of Paris*.

Mr. FRENCH.—*He* was not an archbishop.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—He was an archbishop or bishop of the Church of Rome, and was then in Paris. It is the fact itself I specially refer to. The Archbishop of Paris, with one hundred priests, did so—men who had solemnly undertaken to prevent, by all in their power, the

occurrence of such infamous idolatries and heresies; and the Roman Church is more reprehensible by far for these excesses, because she undertakes to prevent them, than we for modern divisions. That men have appealed to the Bible for authority for that which is against it, is true, just as the Church of Rome has done for proofs and warrants why heretics should be burnt, and Protestants exterminated. But I maintain that the abuse of a thing is no argument in the world against its legitimate use. Our Church is pure within and uncorrupted at the core. Our opponents have no soundness at all. The Church of Rome incorporates various heresies which spring up within her; while the Protestant Church expels them. The Protestant Church employs, as it were, a *centrifugal* force in the treatment of heresy, whereby she scatters it abroad and beyond her pale; whilst the Roman Catholic Church has, in reference to heresy, a *centripetal* power, by which she incorporates every heresy into the very midst of her. We Protestants are no more accountable for the different heresies that appear among us, than Buckingham Palace is for the rubbish which is thrown on either side of it [laughter]; but the Church of Rome *is* accountable, from the very nature of her constitution—as much so as if she hung out an enormous sign-board, to the effect that “All sorts of heresy may be shot and deposited here.” [Laughter.]

It is said, we have differed from early ages. I need not tell you that the Church of Rome has differed in a majority of her forms since the apostolic age. *Penance*, for instance, in the primitive Church, was totally different from the modern Papal sacrament. The criminal, whoever he might be, used to confess his sin to the bishop, and

after having made this confession, it was customary to go in public procession to get public absolution, and after, not before, prescribed penance. And, therefore, the penance enforced in the Roman Church now differs essentially from that of the same Church in more early ages. I need not tell you that the Eucharist is different in the Church of Rome from what it was in the primitive Church. The cup is *now* withdrawn at the administration of the Lord's Supper, and the rite is administered no longer in the vulgar tongue. Hear, again, as to Baptism. I need not tell you that various ceremonies have been added, not known in the Bible, or the apostolic age, or in the subsequent five centuries. These ceremonies have been added and been accumulating by degrees ever since their first existence. If, therefore, there be differences among Protestants, there are still greater and *vital* differences between successive generations of Roman Catholics. Again, I need not tell you of the monastic orders of the Augustinians, the Franciscans, the Eremites, the Benedictines and the Dominicans, the Jesuits and military orders. Now, really, if the apostle Peter were to appear among these different monastic orders, all professing to be branches of the apostolic Church, and to see their banners, read their rules, and listen to their quarrels, most assuredly the apostolic man would forthwith exclaim, "Paul I know, and Apollos I know; but pray, gentlemen, who are you? [Laughter.] I never heard your names nor saw your faces before, and yet you proclaim yourselves apostolical, primitive, and scriptural." Now with respect to *discipline*, there are great differences between the Augustinians and the

Benedictines—between the Franciscans and the Benedictines—and between the Jesuits and the Carthusians. Now all these are the legitimate offspring, at least the protégées, of that Rule of Faith which the Church of Rome has adopted. She is responsible for these obstinate and refractory children. They all form part and parcel of that system of religion which claims to be infallible: they are the rank weeds and the poisonous hemlock of this unprimitive, anti-scriptural, anti-apostolic Rule of Faith. We have been twitted with want of *unity*. The unity of the Church of Rome is, I contend, a nonentity, a mere assumption that has no reality. Unity flows from a community of life and action—from an internal and regenerative principle of life, of concord and object; but the unity of the Church of Rome is the result of *compression*. The unity of the Church of Rome is like the unity of the Tipperary volunteers. Several files of convicts, chained and manacled, were being marched from that Elysium *par excellence*, Tipperary, towards the convict ship in which they were to sail to a far distant spot, well known as Botany Bay, for their country's good, as a stranger asked, "What and who are you, boys?" "Ah, your honour," exclaimed they, rattling their chains, "we're Tipperary volunteers."

The ten tribes that revolted were more united at Bethel than the two. Satan and his archangels are perfectly united. Hell is the site of unity as well as heaven. Unity is also a mark of the kingdom of Satan, for his kingdom is not divided against itself. Better the variations of creed than the unity of error;—far preferable the movements and the impulses of life than the quiescence of death;

better a "living dog than a dead lion." Force and fear make up the union of Rome. The hands of her victims are united like those of the Boys of Tipperary, while their hearts are the antipodes of each other. Better far the strong breeze that occasionally ruffles the surface of Protestantism, than the dead sea—the stagnant waters of the Church of Rome.

All Protestants agree in receiving the twelve articles that constitute the Apostles' Creed—they, as one, uniting in the reception of truth. Our unity is the rejection of error, in our protesting *una voce* against the twelve new articles added by Pope Pius IV. above three hundred years ago.

If, therefore, my opponent, and those who coincide with him in this large assembly, will just take a pair of scissors, and separate these twenty-four articles at the middle, casting out at the window the last twelve, which are just three hundred years old, and retaining the first twelve only, which are eighteen centuries old, the discussion would terminate this evening, and we should be one.

We complain of a gross infraction of unity, by appending the rags of Pope Pius IV. to the seamless robes of Christ. Come, now: let the Bible, like a ploughshare, pass through these weeds of the Vatican, rooting them up for ever; and may the light of the Spirit of God shine on the ancient and apostolic creed, commending it on our hearts and consciences!

But to show you that there is real and enduring unity in the Protestant Church, notwithstanding all the assertions and demurs of my antagonist, also that this is the very unity regarded in our Rule of Faith, and, with all our differences, manifested in all its beauty and com-

pleteness, I refer to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, where I find this unity thus described (4th chapter, vers. 4, 5, 6): "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." Now, I call your attention to each of these seven points of unity, and then I ask every Protestant before me if, whatever be the communions he belongs to, he does not cleave to them? There is "*One Spirit*"—the spirit of wisdom, the spirit of understanding and fear of the Lord;—the spirit of adoption, that is given unto us, whereby we look up and call God "our Father." This is the first syllable of the septiform unity of the Protestant Church which our Rule of Faith sets before us. The next is "one hope." We Protestants look forward to a hope which points to a life beyond the grave—a hope which shall endure when time shall be no more, and repaid more gloriously when the precincts of another world shall surround it—"a hope" which is "a crown of glory that fadeth not away,"—the "blessed hope of the glorious appearing of Christ Jesus our great God and Saviour;" "born again to a lively hope from the resurrection of the dead," to "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." And feeling, moreover, that we are pilgrims journeying through a wilderness "waste and howling," towards a land of enduring gladness, we are cheered by this sacred substantial hope—that when the shadowy things of time shall have departed, and eternity begun its appointed cycles, ours shall be the rich sunshine of "a hope" that cannot beguile; ours a river untainted by pollution;

ours that rest of purity and peace, "which remaineth for the people of God."

The third tone in this Protestant concord is "ONE LORD:" our Prophet, in order to enlighten us; our only Priest, to intercede for us and to plead for us; our only King, to rule over us and to restrain us. Do you not, my fellow Protestants, regard him—"the one Lord"—as the *way* by which you rise from the depths of human corruption even to the bosom of God; as "the one *truth*" which inspires our creed and irradiates the darkness of our paths; as the one *life* which quickens the dead with an immortal and undying life? Do you not regard this one Lord as made unto you wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and complete redemption? and would not every Protestant in this room, if they were to give utterance to the full feelings of their hearts, exclaim, "That Lord is to me all in all?"

The next part of our unity is "*one faith*." Instead of a sacrifice oft-times repeated, which can never take away sin, like that of the Mass, we have "ONE SACRIFICE ONCE FOR ALL"—is not that your faith? Instead of many priests offering oft-times the same sacrifice which can never take away sin, we have a Priest who has offered up Himself—the altar his Godhead, the sacrifice his humanity; who has entered into heaven, sprinkling the blood of atonement on the holy place, and ever living to make intercession for us. Our "*one faith*" is that he is the only Purgatory—not the fabulous and contemptible locality in which, according to the Roman Catholic Church, material fire is to purify immaterial souls,—but a far more glorious Purgatory, into which to step by faith, is to enter into the region of light, as

the blood of Christ Jesus cleanses from all sin. Never forget, my dear Roman Catholic friends, that *that* is the only purgatory through which you pass from earth to heaven. If you miss *that* purgatory you are lost for ever.

Our next element of unity is, "*one baptism*." Have we not all one baptism?—the sign and seal of admission to the outward privileges, and to hearing the great and sanctifying truths of the Gospel—administered in the same way, in the same holy name. Have we not "*one baptism*" "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—our triune Jehovah, our covenant God?

The next feature is, "*one body*"—Christ, who ever sympathizes with us, who is ever tender and compassionate. If my little finger is hurt, the nerve conveys the sensation to the head, and the whole system sympathizes with it. So is the feeling of this "*one body*." If the least orphan in this assembly suffer the sensation, it goes through all, and touches Christ the Head.

Again, "*one God and Father of us all*." His bosom is open to the reception of us all; by supremacy of dominion over us all, by providence through us all, by inhabitation in us all. Now, then, here are the *seven* evidences of the "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Protestant Church." I ask the Independent, if there be any in this room, Is not this the Church to which you belong? I ask the Churchman, Is not this the Church to which *you* belong? I ask the Baptist, Is not this the Church to which you belong? I ask the Wesleyan, if any, Is not that the Church to which you belong? If there be diversities, they exist in subordinate particulars; but, as regards vital, essential, and fundamental truth, we are all ONE

—essentially, eternally one; and I would rather endure martyrdom than abjure that truth, or appear to deny it.

But the diversities of the Church of Rome exist on subjects the most momentous. One believes in the infallibility of the pope; another, of the pope with a council; another, the infallibility of the whole Church; and the most important doctrines of the Church are doctrines on which so many doubts and disputations necessarily arise, that it is impossible ever to come to an harmonious conclusion. But, we say, though we differ in *externals*, on vital questions we are one. Suppose, now, you had been present at the field of Waterloo, and suppose the command was given for marching forth to battle; you would see the English soldier with his facings of silver and burnished epaulettes, you would see the Highlander with his belted plaid and philabeg, and all the other parts of Highland warlike costume, you would see the Irishman arrayed in his national garb. Suppose an ignorant person was led into the field where they were all regularly marshalled: he might say,—“Why, these individuals will all arise up one against another; they cannot constitute one army; they seem to be different battalions, totally distinct from each other—surely they cannot be of any service; they want unity; they cannot make a united attack.” But what is the fact? There exists among them but one common feeling of loyalty to the throne, but one fervid affection to their beloved land, and all rush with one simultaneous onset to the attack—the Englishman, the Highlander, and the Irishman merging all their shades and varieties of feeling, association, and habit, into one burning sensation of enthusiasm to preserve the throne invio-

late, and to bequeath unscathed its privileges and blessings to the latest posterity. [Sensation.] So is it with Protestantism—we are divided into different regiments, it is true, the corps is made up of different battalions; but the difference is only, I contend, in uniform, in subordinate regimentals and particulars, and not in aught that is essential and saving.

Having thus noticed the vital and monstrous diversities in the Church of Rome, and the small and insignificant divisions among Protestants, I conclude by repeating what I before stated,—that the Church of Rome, in her capacity, is responsible for all the corruptions and heresies and diversities within her pale; but we, in our capacity, are not at all responsible for those corruptions or heresies which have been laid at our door; and therefore, I have neutralized his objections of a preceding evening.

Mr. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen, I shall not mis-spend my time in endeavouring to shake or disabuse your minds of that imputation which the learned gentleman has been attempting to affix upon my character—namely, of having clothed myself this evening, in order to gain some advantage over him in this disputation—of having clothed myself, I say, in the impious garb of an infidel; at another time, of having affected to coincide with the prime tenet of the Unitarians; at another, of appearing to profess myself a Quaker. I appeared, however, ladies and gentlemen, as you can all attest—and I apprehend my learned friend knew very well what I meant—under no such garbs and in no such character; but it afforded him a little subject for his playful oratory, and of course he indulged in it very prettily and romantically

as usual. I did, gentlemen, certainly did for a moment, by way of argument, very common among logicians in all countries and of all creeds, suppose myself doubting Scripture inspiration and the authenticity of the inspired text. This is admissible in all places where consecutive reasoning is carried on; and my consolation is, that in resorting to it, my intention was to illustrate and corroborate my original positions, and to show the weakness and untenableness of those of my opponent. In Catholic seminaries, when students in theology are endeavouring to render their understandings penetrating and acute, by bringing, as it were anticipatively, all parts of polemical warfare into action, it is very common for one person to act the Protestant in dispute, and with emulous though fictitious ardour, sustain the cause of Protestantism, whilst his fellow-Catholic, his antagonist (as is natural enough) by an overwhelming torrent of solid argument, calls forth all his acuteness and all the full collection of his powers. They attack and reply, *alternis vicibus*, in mutual onset and defence, in order to give acumen to their understandings, and to enable them to meet with prompt energy all the artifices of heresy, when they quit the sham battle and come forth into the real field of action. And is such a mode of argument, in the mind of any man, let me ask, endowed with liberality and enlarged by reason, to be considered as a kind of stain upon their moral character? Oh! the learned gentleman is merely sportive and good-naturedly satirical, for, I am sure, however grave his countenance, he cannot be serious, and I shall therefore drop the subject.

But, my learned friend [turning to Mr. Cumming], what I wish

most emphatically to ask you is, whilst soaring into all the regions of hyperbole and metaphor, and indulging in your usual facile vein of oratory, How is it that you have forgotten to substantiate the authenticity of the Bible, and to prove in every successive age from apostolic days the perpetual visibility of *your* Church? You gave us one reason as to the verification of the Bible, and a specious kind of plausible reason it was. I required you to take book after book, or, if that was insufficient for the purpose, I invited you to take them all together, and to prove, without the tradition of the Catholic Church, that grand predominant argument—to prove, *if you can*, the sacred infallible *authenticity* of any one of those books. You were *unable* to do it; and perceiving with your usual acuteness your confusing, entangling, embarrassing situation, you lapsed, as usual, into one of your somniferous sermons [laughter] and endeavoured to extinguish my luminous train of argument, as usual, by a cloud of words. You attempted, indeed; but very feebly, I believe, even in your own estimation, and as unsatisfactorily to your expectant audience. My learned opponent, however, for I must do him justice, did, even in these his moments of most visible perturbation, make an effort to prove the keeping of the Sabbath—to prove, I say, that Sunday was pointed out in the pages of the New Testament as the day of the Lord. But, my friends, it was a most miserable failure! Indeed, he seems sensible of it, and so he left the subject with incredible velocity. There is no text, my friends, as you are well aware, that can possibly lend the least aid in extricating the Protestant from the malediction of the ancient Testament, denounced

against those who should impiously dare to neglect the observance of the specifically appointed day ; but, if you apply to TRADITION, then you can justify it,—if not, he is pronounced guilty by that Book, which he pretends to venerate with a kind of predominance of affection when compared to that entertained for it by us Catholics.

Again, my friend endeavoured to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. Now, mark how illogically he proceeded—with what vainly toiling diligence, though with his usual unobstructed rapidity, he turned over the pages of the sacred volume—mark, I say, how illogically he proceeded to prove that there was a Trinity at all ; in the second place, that the Holy Ghost was a person of that Trinity ; in the third place, that he proceeded from the Father and from the Son. Because, he says, the Holy Spirit is *called* God—but does it say that he constitutes one Person of a Trinity ? Might not the words “Holy Spirit” be applied to God without violation of any of the proprieties of language, without superinducing a third Person ? Might not one contend, without tradition, that the words were figurative ? My learned friend, one would imagine, would be able to solve this, addicted as he is so much to the spirit of oratory and nothing else—for I never accused him of logic. [Laughter.] In one word, might it not, according to the analogy of language, be considered just as figurative as the word is, when in metaphorical expression I say, “It is the *spirit of oratory* that actuates, that animates the bosom of my learned friend : logic never found a dwelling there.” But how does he prove the procession from the Father and the Son ? In this mode :—“The *Spirit whom*

I will send from the Father.” That is literally the text by which my learned and authentic friend intends to prove that the third Person proceeds from the Father and the Son. Oh shame ! shame on such contemptible logic ; such puerility ; such gross, palpable undervaluing of the understandings of his audience. I wonder, indeed, he did not blush deeply when he uttered it. [Laughter.] How, again, has he attempted to prove the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son with the Holy Ghost ? Why, most ingeniously—namely, by not alluding to it *at all*.

Again, abandoning his cool reason, he exclaims—The Catholic Church in early ages was deeply infected with Arianism. If so, I exclaim in my turn, You have great reason, my Protestant brethren, to be afraid of the authenticity of the Bible. The original of the Bible being lost, where is your prudence, your reasonableness, in trusting to these copies, seeing that you had them from our Church, which is, according to you, a corrupted Church ? Are you not afraid, lest that corrupted Church should have inserted corrupted texts in the Scripture to favour its corruptions, since the Scripture has been under its guardianship and sole custody for so many hundred years ? Who were those who copied out the manuscripts from age to age, before the invention of letters and printing, but the monks in our Catholic convents ? Were there no Calvinists lurking in their “caves and caverns”—though I always thought your Church [turning to Mr. Cumming,] was to be “seated on a *hill*,” according to ancient prophecy, where all might see it [laughter], and where the nations might flow into it ; but were there no Calvinists, in their gloomy pent-up caverns you lately alluded to, copying out the

Bible? I always understood from Lord Bacon, and from Hooker, that the *Catholic Church* fostered and preserved the Bible in her sacred bosom. And I say, if it was so, that Protestants knowing this indisputable fact, that the Catholics from age to age were the sole proprietors and preservers of the Bible, and having such an opinion of their "abominable and idolatrous" disposition, they should be—my learned friend as well as yourselves—should be deeply suspicious, irremediably, ay, inconsolably desponding and mistrustful, as to the veracity of that Bible. I, for my part, perfectly agree that the Arians, to whom the learned and eloquent Hooker alludes, where he says, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity" (vol. i. p. 286; vol. i. Hanbury's edition), were not groundless in their suspicion, if my learned friend's premises as to the corruption of the Church be once granted:—

"They who measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome, think every man so much the more sound by how much he can make the corruptions thereof more large. And therefore, some there are—namely, the Arians in reformed Churches of Poland—who imagine the canker to have eaten so far into the bones and marrow of the Church of Rome, as if it had not so much as a sound belief: no, not concerning God himself, but that the *very belief of the Trinity were a part of antichristian corruption.*"

Now let my learned friend look seriously to this: it is a question that deserves to be so deeply considered, that my learned friend will, I have no doubt, run away from it with his usual lightness and agility. But perchance, my opponent may dare to say that I am professing myself an Arian, by bringing forward this extract. No, my friends,

what I wish to inculcate is simply this: If it be true that the Catholics were such vile corrupters of every thing sacred in heaven and earth—if it be true that they were so, I say that the Arians were well founded in their supposition that the *Trinity* itself (a name, by-the-bye, not to be found in the Protestant Rule of Faith, namely, the Bible) was an interpolation in the creed of Christians on the part of the blasphemous and idolatrous Papist. Will my learned friend now say, in his own exquisitely peculiar logic, that I am now professing Arianism? No, my friends, whatever he may think proper to insinuate, I will say boldly, that I scorn Arius as I do all other heretics; I pity too much the wanderings of human reason to reproach any man with heresy; but when they attempt to assail the verities of my Church, and to blaspheme every thing that I deem sacred, I must tell them to their faces—*ἐξήλθον ἐξ ἡμῶν. They went out of us; we did not leave them.* We clave, and still cleave, and will for ever cleave most unrelinquishably, to the Rock of Ages. We have records of the fact; we marked the day when their heresy (I mean that of the Arians) arose, as we did when all others arose. St. Augustine noted, as my learned friend told us, *ninety-odd* heresies at such a period, and other fathers noted a great number more. St. Epiphanius has left a large bulky volume, full of the heresies of that impugned Church. The great mother, the Catholic Church, always had its watchmen on her high towers, with the pen in hand, to note down the different heresies and schisms as they successively raised up their proud, their insolently daring heads at different periods of time, in the vain hope of obscuring her eternal radiance.

And I must inform my learned friend that, with its wonted accuracy and fidelity, ay, to the very hour, we noted down the heresies of Calvin and of Luther. We have them marked down in our books, and there they are to be found at this day, with their indelible brand upon them.

I say, then, that you have no right to maintain, on the supposition that the Catholics were so depraved and so addicted to idolatry as you inculcate—you have no right to believe the sacred volume to be incorrupt. But what I call on you for is, and what I shall reiterate aloud in an emphatic manner many and many a time—I reiterate, that it is in *vain* trying to prove the authenticity of your Rule of Faith; you shrink from it. You play the sophist and the orator; and seem to make it matter at once of your solace and your glory, when sunk down by my ponderous argument—that you will be enabled, by the powerful allurements of mere words and sentences, however unconnected, to effect more than I can by the most methodical, systematic reasoning. Yes, I repeat it, you flatter yourself that you will be enabled to predominate over me in the end, by a random outpouring of texts and your poesies of metaphor and rhetoric. [Laughter.]

Following my notes, I perceive that my reverend antagonist, in reference to the doctrine of Purgatory, ridicules the idea of material fire purging the immaterial soul. This is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome, *as of faith*, that there is any fire at all, material or immaterial. We only maintain a *third state*. There is no article of our faith which says there is to be fire, whether material or immaterial.

But I must say, by this mode of cavilling, the learned gentleman is

always giving an opportunity to the Deist to ridicule religion in all his arguments. The same mode by which he ridicules material fire—the possibility of material fire reaching immaterial spirit—if it affords a subject of ridicule to him, does it not offer the same material, and will it not afford a subject of ridicule to the Deist and the Infidel, when he argues against the existence of such a place as hell? But has my learned friend, of such transcendent *merit* in Bible lore, never read in that his Rule of Faith of an *immaterial spirit eating material food*? and is not the one as reconcilable to his notions of things as the other? Surely, my learned friend is well enough versed in the Hebrew Bible to find the Hebrew passage to which I allude.

Again, my Bible-learned antagonist exclaims, “One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.” Now, does the learned gentleman attend to the meaning of these words? Our complaint against you is, that you have not *one* baptism. We Catholics of all nations have. But you have various; you differ in the mode of administering baptism. Some cry out most vehemently for baptism in the proper scriptural form; some cry out that it is a superstition; and yet, with such incoherence, such diversity of views on this vital point amongst your various sects, you have the daring to appeal to them, looking around this room for their sympathies in your favour. Why, the Anabaptist declares that your baptism is invalid, and that your baptism of infants is not justifiable by the Gospel. My friend tells me that some divine of my Church has asserted that it is pointed out in the Gospel. I care not whether he does or does not—I maintain that there is no sanction for it in the pages of the New Testament, and I call on

him for texts, or else his religion is at an end, it is a *caput mortuum*. His baptism is invalid; and he had much better go over to the Church of the Baptists and join them, and thus reconcile his deed to his words, by holding up his rule on one hand and his line of conduct on the other in strict conformity.

And now, my friends, a few words as to the "*impregnable*," "*unscathed*," "*unassailable*" Protestantism—those three lustrous epithets applied by my learned friend to that opaque body of errors. [Laughter.] I shall soon show you whether Protestantism be impregnable, unscathed, and unassailable. I am going now, my friends—I am about now to prove that the Reformation, which so much disturbed the order, and deranged the harmony of things in ecclesiastical Europe, which confounded or endeavoured to trample down all the wisdom of antiquity in the dust, and to erect a multitude of ever-changing, ever innovating churches in its stead—that such a work of devastation and unhallowed anarchy could not proceed from the Spirit of God, but that it must of necessity have been incubated over by "the father of lies." These are strong words: but I will prove to you their coherence, their propriety, and most incontrovertibly their truth. When the Reformation arose in this country, and the Bible was taken as the Rule of Faith, one would naturally think, my friends, (on the supposition that the Reformation is to be called blessed,) that the original founders of your sects must have been men replenished with the utmost sanctity, and that they must have been assisted, if they were really producing a good work, by the "Father of Lights." But, my friends, let us approach this subject with impartial and un-

prejudiced minds, and let us see from their own writings, whether they were indeed guided by the great God of Heaven, or by that evil spirit that "roameth about the earth seeking whom he may devour." Hear, then, Calvin on the Corinthians. Talking of Paul:

"He is full of cold and heat, of presumption, temerity, and precipitation."—*Calvin on 1 Cor. vii. 3.*

Such is the reverential way, my friends, in which the man who gave the name to my friend's church—the blameless, the harmless, the heaven-resuscitated Calvin—characterizes Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles.

But Calvin, among reformers, is not the sole champion who hath been stout against the Lord with a wildly-blaspheming tongue. Listen to Quintinus:

"He was not a *chosen*, but a broken vessel."—*Quintinus apud Resciam in præf. Rimistromachie.*

Again, the centuriators of Magdeburg, well known to my learned friend, and to every gentleman of the Protestant religion in this room:—

"He (Paul) was impatient and in desperation during his afflictions in Asia, dissensious towards Barnabas, and hypocritical towards James and others."—*Centur. 1st, lib. ii. c. x.*

Such is their estimate of this apostle.

Bullinger (for blasphemy is epidemic among these newly heaven-raised teachers), talking of St. John the Evangelist:—"In his promptitude to adore the angel he had sinned in apostasy."—*Comment. in xix. v. 22 Apocal.*

Quintinus calls the apostle (Paul), "*juvenem stolidum*—a foolish youth." [Laughter.]—*Apud Resciam, loco citato.*

Luther affirms of James, that he was "a perverter of St. Paul's doc-

trine—that his epistle was bastard, counterfeit, wicked, and unapostolical.”—*Luther*, tom. v. folio 439, 440.

Calvin, that is, my learned friend’s friend [laughter] and prototype, says of St. Matthew:—“He (St. Matthew) abused, distorted, and alleged unaptly divers citations.”—*Calvin in Comm. Matt.* ii. 15, viii. 13, xxi. 17, xxvii. 9.

Luther tells us that “St. Luke was excessive in commending good works.”—*Luth. Acts* xv.

Bravo! prime workman of the glorious Reformation! [Laughter.]

Calvin again says, “The apostles were superstitious, and subject to vice.”—*Calv. in Acts*, xxi. 23.

Now comes on the scene another mighty reformer, *full of the effusion of the Spirit*, the renowned Zuinglius! Let us hear his heaven-inspired doctrine.

“It is a great error,” says he, “of the old doctors, that they supposed the external water of baptism to be of any value towards the purging of sin.”—*Zuing.* tom. ii. *de Bapt.*, fol. 70.

One passage from Zuinglius, however, speaks properly, and I would wish to press it upon my reverend friend’s attention at present, as well as upon his memory hereafter. It may perchance contribute to check or silence that eternal bawl of Methodism, namely, “Search the Scriptures.”

His words are:—“Quotiescunque sive Christus, sive apostoli, ad Scripturam relegant auditores, intelligent non suas aut epistolas aut evangelium, *sed vetus testamentum.*” That is, “So often as Christ or the apostles refer us to the Scriptures, they do not understand thereby their Epistles or the Gospels, *but the Old Testament.*”

Ochinus, another of these luminous reformers, says:—“Non debemus plura credere quam credi-

derunt sancti fœderis antiqui;” that is, “We ought not to believe more than the saints of the *Old Testament* believed in.” Whence he infers, that we should not be bound to believe the Trinity, Consubstantiality, &c.—*Ochinus*, lib. ii. *Dialog.* pp. 154, 155.

This is, my friends, to the heart’s content of my rev. antagonist, a beautiful illustration of the *one faith of Protestants*. [Laughter.]

But let us sound again the grand imposing name—the apostle of reform himself, the immortal Luther, the man raised up by the right hand of God! Listen, my friends, attentively: for when he speaks, edification must follow!

His words are:—“Ne ingeratur nobis Moyses; nos in Novo Testamento Moysem nec videre, nec audire volumus!” that is, “Let not Moses be thrust in upon us; we, in the New Testament, will not either see or hear Moses.”—*Luth. in Serm. de Moise.*

Now come we—for *unity* among Protestants must be proved to-day most copiously, or my rev. friend, I know, will be out of humour with me—[laughter]—come we to the famous Bucer! What says he, at the dawn of that auspicious era, when the Spirit that dictated the Reformation was in the plenitude of its effusion? Listen:—

“If all be true that the Evangelists affirm, Christ must be truly and really in the sacrament. But whether we be bound to believe absolutely everything set down by them, I will not judge.”—*Saunders, de Schism. Ang.*, lib. ii. p. 332.

The first reforming apostle of Moravia, according to Prateolus, derided the notion of there being a Holy Ghost. The words of Prateolus are:—“Irrisit Spiritum Sanctum, dixitque se velle potius redire in cœnobium, quam credere

in Spiritum Sanctum;” that is, “He (the apostle of Moravia) turned into ridicule the Holy Ghost, saying, he would rather return into the cloister than believe in him.”

Again, my friends, the Baptists will furnish my learned antagonist with another transcendent proof of the *glorious inspiration of Protestantism*, and its admirable unity—the Baptists, I say, who *ipso facto* omit baptism towards children as unprofitable.

But now, a few words on the Rule of Faith that produces *this wondrous unity* among the choice of God’s faithful, who *shone as lights* among their respective admirers, all of them being, as ye see, *likeminded in the fellowship of the Spirit!* [Laughter.]

Joannes Dietenburgius, the Protestant, has collected in *Luther’s* translation of the Bible 874 *corruptions!!!*

Esmerus, who succeeded Luther and Melancthon, has discovered in it 1,400 *falsifications!!!*

Broughton, to the Lords of the Council, affirmed that the Bibles of England were *foully corrupted!!!*

Dr. Reynolds required, “That there may be a new translation of the Bible, because the former were corrupt!” What a beautiful Rule of Faith!

The Puritans cried out, that the translations of the Bible cause millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to eternal flames.

Calvin declares, talking of Philip Melancthon, “Si Philippus declaret, verbo tantum me a sua mente deflectere, protenus desistam.” That is, “If Philip should but intimate that I am in the least point at variance with his conceptions, I will immediately desist.”

Well, see now what are the conceptions of Melancthon, and Pro-

testant unity will reap a fresh laurel!

“I would to God,” says Melancthon, “it were in my power to restore the government of the bishops. For I see what kind of a church we have, such ecclesiastical polity being dissolved.”—He goes on to say, “Video postea multo intolerabiliorem tyrannidem futuram quam antea unquam fuit;” that is, “I perceive that hereafter there will be a far more intolerable tyranny than has ever yet existed.”

This was in regard to bishops; for Calvin, as you know, had abolished bishops, maintaining that they were unapostolical, and not to be found in the Gospel. Nay, Calvin himself thus writes to his friend Farel:—“Deus nunc dat videre, quantum præcipiti iudicio, vehementiaque inconsulta abjiciendi ita Pontificis nocuerimus.” That is, “God now shows us most evidently what harm we have done by thus, in our headlong inconsiderateness and rash precipitancy, casting off the Pope.”—*Ep. ad Farel. 6.*

The Calvinists, however, still continue, as ye well know, to cry out stoutly—and my reverend antagonist will, beyond all doubt, be amongst the most clamorous of them,—“No imposition of hands!”—“No bishops!” I say, will my learned friend exclaim, most fervently, unless, perchance, he should have a mitre in view,—a glittering species of object in the eyes of Protestantism, of a most irresistible nature.—[Laughter.]

But why, after all, should any scruple be entertained on this ground? since Junius, a celebrated Calvinist, lays it down, that *imposition of hands* properly means, “a shaking the elected into the assembly by his right hand.” [Laughter.]

The true Scotchman, however, to this day, is most uncompromising upon that subject. His language

is still that of his forefathers, namely, "*Bishops are not members of Christ, but of antichrist.*" "*All this proud generation must down: bishops, deacons, archdeacons, are no members of the Church.*"

Now, my friends, judge ye whether the Spirit of God was hovering over your Church in its infancy. Listen to Calvin, and shudder when I explain his words. My learned friend, I perceive, already begins to tremble, knowing well what is forthcoming, at least foreboding it. [Sibilation.]

Listen earnestly, my friends, most earnestly, I do beseech you. Calvin is about to teach theology to this assembly: surely, where Protestants are all united in *one fraternal bond*, Calvin is worth hearing. Speaking of crimes and their fountain head, his very words are these:—

"Quando facimus adulterium aut homicidium, Dei opus est, motoris, auctoris, atque impulsoris." That is, my friends, translated with the utmost literality: "When we commit adultery or murder, *it is the work of God, the mover, author, and impeller.*"

REV. J. CUMMING—[quickly]—Give me the authority.

MR. FRENCH.—Oh, to be sure. *Calv. Turciem*, volume as above.

REV. J. CUMMING.—The page?

MR. FRENCH.—Page! I really wish you'd furnish me with some of those texts you quoted so rapidly in exchange. [Laughter.] But you shall have the page—it is p. 691 *ad* 701.

Zuinglius says (for there is, I perceive, upon grand points, something like unity among the *prime boys of the Reformation*),

"*Latro, Deo impulsore occidit, et sapenumero cogitur ad peccandum.*" That is, and my learned antagonist will warrant that I translate with strict fidelity, "*The robber,*

by God's impulsion or impelling, doth kill, and is oftentimes constrained to kill." —Zuinglius *de Providentia Dei*, tom. i. fol. 365.

Again, Calvin, 1st Institute, liber 1, chap. xiii., *ever orthodox*, as my reverend friend will verify, wishes that the name of the Trinity were buried, rejecting out of his prayer-books the clause, "Glory be to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost."

Rogers, "*Contra Familiam Londinensem*," A.D. 1579, art. 24-25, says, "Such is *the Family of Love*, rejecting the Trinity and Divinity of Christ as *Papistical fictions.*"

And indeed, my friends, to speak truth, I declare that they had a right to be suspicious, after the manner, the distorted manner, in which you attempt to prove the systematic corruption of Christianity by popes and councils. They were perfectly right, I say (supposing the picture my friend draws of the all-corrupting Papist to be true), in suspecting those dogmas to be an invention of one of the dark ages.

Again, in Luther we find his soul did detest the word *ὁμοουσιον*—that is, *consubstantial*, between the persons of the Holy Trinity.—*Luther, Enchiridio Precum*, 1543.

And to prove to you, my friends, *that the plenteous effusion of Divine grace* at the period of the Reformation (as your historians uniformly call it) was producing on this subject at least something like *unity*, listen to the following fact, with its attestation:

"The Servetians, that is, the followers of Servetus—whom that meek, that lamb-like Christian, good Calvin, procured to be burned at a stake,—these Servetians, if we may believe Beza, called the Blessed Trinity (great God, whom I adore with all the powers of my soul, forgive me if I give it utterance!)

"a three-headed Cerberus, or hell-hound."—Beza, ep. 81.

Now mark, my friends, how this *unity of opinion*, as to fundamental points, spread widely among the ever-blessed Reformers. A solemn embassy was sent by all the Calvinists in Poland, to Zurich and Geneva, importuning them to have *the mystery of the Trinity* abolished. Whilst the Calvinian synod at Vilna, A.D. 1589, May 2nd, issued a public decree, forbidding ministers in sermons to mention the name of Trinity.

Again, let me give you another impious dogma of this innocent Reformer, Calvin. He affirms, in his Institutes, the name of God peculiarly to belong to God the Father.—*Calv. Inst.* c. 14, n. 3, and *Contr. Valentin.* lib. 2.

Again, he affirms Christ our Lord to be but a second king next to God, and a second cause of life.—*Calv. in cap. vi. in Joann.* v. 57.

And yet, my friends, if this your illustrious reformer had ever studied St. Paul, he must have known that Christ, "*the Lord of Glory*" and "*the Prince of life*," "thought it not robbery to be equal to God."

But again, after having thus impiously dogmatized, he launches into fresh blasphemies. He maintains, (in c. 1, Coloss. v. 20,)—"that God in heaven is not dutifully and sincerely served without sin, even by the angels themselves;" and yet methinks he might have learned from the Book of Revelations that "nothing defiled can enter into the kingdom of heaven."

And now, my friends, having thus exhibited to you a drawing of Calvin's mind from his own pencil, let us see what his contemporary Protestants thought of him.

Stancharius, in *Epistola contra Calvinum*, N. 4-5, has these words: "Cave, Christiane lector, et

maxime vos ministri omnes verbi Dei, à verbis Calvini cavete, et præsertim in articulo de Trinitate." That is, "Beware, Christian reader, and especially all ye ministers of the word of God, beware of the books of Calvin, and especially on THE ARTICLE OF THE TRINITY."—*Stancharius in Epist. cont. Calv.* No. 4-5.

Again, here is Joannes Schutz, another Protestant writer of those times. I am endeavouring, remember, to substantiate the position of my learned friend, which he so seriously lays down without the least flickering of a smile on his countenance, that there is perfect unanimity, perfect like-mindedness still among Protestants.

Well! let us hear the testimony of Joannes Schutz. His words are:—

"Arianismus, Mahometismus, Calvinismus, tres fratres et sorores, tres caligæ ejusdem panni." That is, "Arianism, Mahometism, and Calvinism, are three brothers and sisters, three pair of breeches of the same cloth." [Laughter.]

I did not wish to keep all this Latin as a "*bonne bouche*," [turning to Mr. Cumming,] for, my dear and esteemed friend, [laughter] I thought it but fair to let the bulk of the audience enjoy it also in plain English. [Laughter.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—Give the reference.

MR. FRENCH.—Yes! you shall have it—all regularly "cut and dried"—all ready to afford fresh gratification, when you take the trouble of consulting the original sources from which my learning flows. Note down, then, *ad confirmationem rei*, Joannes Schutz, in *Lib. 50, causarum. Causa 40*; and you will be sure to find it.

But, my friends, I have not yet done with Master Calvin; I must

let you hear what another celebrated writer of those days, and of Protestant celebrity, says of him. Adam Newser writes in these memorable words, and I beg of my reverend friend to hoard them up in his memory.

“Qui timet ne incidat in Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum.” That is, “He who has a dread of falling into Arianism, let him beware of Calvinism.”—*Adam Newser, apud Schlusentl. c. 13, citato, fol. 9, et in catal. hieat. Lib. i. p. 4.*

My friend expressed his sympathy some time ago, lest I should be lapsing into Arianism. Now Calvin his dear Calvin, his learned master, would not, it appears, if he were living, deem it matter of so great lamentation if I did fall into that species of heresy.

And now, my friends, one word more as to Calvin and Beza, and I shall lay open another little sour source of learning, as to the wonderful flood of light that burst in upon the world among those *heavenly men* of the Reformation in elucidating the pages of the Bible.

Know, then, that Calvin calls in question the sixth chapter of St. John, and that Beza calls in question the eighth chapter! You remember, my friends, how frequently my rev. antagonist, in the raging hours of his *Patrophobia*, when the disorder was at its height, was wont to cry out:—“Pshaw! these Fathers are for ever knocking their heads against one another.” Let us now see how grand reformers hold their heads aloft in conscious pride and sweetest unanimity!

Upon Christ's entering amongst his disciples after his crucifixion, the doors being shut, Calvin says that he knocked and so obtained entrance. Afterwards he affirms that by his Divine virtue he opened them.

Bullinger says that an angel opened them.

Aretrus says that they opened of their own accord.

Peter Martyr says that he entered in at the window.

Simonius says that he entered in by the chinks of the door.

Thalman says that his body diminished one-third, and so passed through.

Others maintained that he entered in at the tunnel of the chimney.

This *Zuinglius*, in ridiculing the idea that Christ could come out of the sepulchre without removing the stone, which Luther with truth affirmed, has the following words:

“Crassus Lutheri prætor rubris idutus caligis, eodem modo quo Christus monumento exivit, egredi potuerit.” That is, “Luther's fat servant, appareed in his red hose, in like manner as Christ went out of the sepulchre, might himself also have issued.”—Which, my friends, you must all know, is most impiously affirmed by your *Reformer*, *Zuinglius*, inasmuch as, if the New Testament speak truth, Christ issued from the sepulchre of his own force and power, without removing the stone.—[Laughter throughout these extracts.]

But, gentlemen, where should I end, were I to attempt enumerating the various blasphemies of your various Reformers?

Calvin asserts, that our blessed Saviour descended into hell, and suffered there the pains of the damned.

Latimer, your venerable martyr, *Latimer*, asserts the same shuddering blasphemy.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[*The learned gentleman read these extracts so very rapidly, that Mr. Cumming was obliged to interrupt him, saying:—*The last reference, if you please?

Mr. FRENCH.—I really have not time. I will if you give me time for it.—[Nothing further ensued.]

Mr. FRENCH—(*in continuation*). Both Beza and Calvin teach that good works are nugatory, that man was saved *by faith alone*. And Luther had the daring impiety to add the word “alone” to the words “saved by faith” in his translation of the Bible.

Yes, my friends, this is the man inspired by God, forsooth, to illuminate mankind, and become *the Father of that blessed Reformation* that has engendered all the different sects which now stand around me and take part with my antagonist; though with him they are as vitally, as fundamentally at variance in points of the highest moment to salvation, as they are with me.

Again—for it is time to advert to another subject—Calvin tells us that the books of the Bible are to be recognised by the *inward spirit alone!*

Here is the great and illustrious master of my learned friend telling me that the way to prove the authenticity of canonical writing is by “*the inward spirit!*” And what does not this “inward spirit” prompt men to do? What odious, repulsive doctrines does it not prompt both men and women to broach? How comes it, I ask, that this “internal spirit” inspires such opposite deductions? Luther, out of *his spirit*, gave judgment that the Epistle of James was a *straw* or *chaffy epistle*, unworthy of an apostle. Calvin, by *his inward spirit*, was led to doubt, as I have before proved, the sixth chapter of St. John; and Beza was moved by *his inward spirit* to call in question the eighth of the same Evangelist. Now, my friends, even if the eloquence of my learned friend, —and I have always acknowledged

it to be of a very loquacious, luxuriating, and unbounded description—could have operated upon me so as to induce me to quit the Old Rock, covered as it is with such unanswerable glories and soul-inspiring, never-to-be-obliterated associations of spiritual delight; for “my dove, my undefiled, is one,” say the Canticles, “and her voice is sweet, and her face comely;”—but should I, I say, in an evil hour be allured by thy syren tongue to quit her whom “my soul loveth,” and “begin to wander after the flocks of *thy* companions,” tell me, I adjure thee, my reverend friend, into the porticos of which of your conflicting churches should I enter? Tell me, after having thrown away the light of ages, the lamp of Catholicity, in which of your dismal habitations, your howling wildernesses, shall my soul find a secure harbour, so as never to be tossed about again by any new wind of doctrine? In which, I say, of your motley conventicles, does the *Spirit of Truth* inhabit by the promise of its God, so that the finger of history, with clearness and perspicuity, shall point out its existence from age to age, and thus rescue it from the imputation of being a mere modern edifice, an upstart invention of yesterday?

By what test is this *inward spirit* to be tried amongst you? What uniform settled principle of judging prevails amongst you? By what bond of sympathy do ye stand this day united against the Catholic, save and except unrelenting hatred to your ancient mother? My friend the Quaker tells me (and he is the best and most moral of you all) that baptism by water is not necessary; nay, that it is superfluous. The Baptist (and I candidly confess, that if, spurning away tradition, I took the Bible for my sole Rule of

Faith, I would rather be baptized in his way than in any other)—the Baptist, I say, tells me that I must be plunged into water, according to the unquestioned practice of the primitive Church, and to the true meaning of the word, βαπτίζω, in the New Testament. But I, as a Catholic, tell him, and say to you all, that I must be lost for ever if I “seek that knowledge in my own forum which God commands me to seek at the lips of the priest.” Yes, it is there I seek knowledge as to the mode of baptism; under the guidance of “the Angel of the Lord of Hosts,” (Malach.)—I am under no apprehension lest I should have been led to a wrong fountain. No, my friends, my Church was based by Christ himself upon Peter; each of yours has *Ego* for its basis. Were the Bible extinguished and abolished, the Church I cling to would still exist in unimpaired strength, because God has promised that the Spirit of all Truth shall abide with it to the consummation of time, and endue it with corresponding holiness; and I am bound to hear the Church, under pain of being “a heathen man or a publican.” I am bound to know nothing but what the Church teaches. I am to look into the Bible which the Church puts into my hand as a sacred book; and the moment I open it, I find that “the priest’s lips shall keep knowledge, for he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts.”

And here my friend accuses us of translating the word γυνή woman. Why, I would ask him in return, do Protestants translate αγγελος sometimes “angel,” and sometimes “messenger?” Why, for a very deep purpose—because they wished to take away from the dignity of the priesthood, and therefore they tame it down to “he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts.”

I will, therefore, tell my learned friend, with the utmost candour, that *if* he can prove to me how his Rule of Faith can lead to *unity*, that he has made considerable progress in weaning me from the Rock of Ages: he will certainly have done so if he can prove its authenticity by any other mode than by that of tradition; I say if he can prove that, he will be doing much towards approximating me to Luther’s or Calvin’s Church. But, my friends, I have given him, at his request, two nights longer; and I must say, that though I have beaten him off the field, night after night, [laughter], still he comes to the contest with undaunted valour, and *seemingly* unconscious of the least ignominy. Really, he is a Scotchman of the true breed; and I should love the manliness of character he displays, if it were not in so bad a cause. [Laughter.] I don’t myself know a man of more consummate eloquence, and unconquerable perseverance in returning to the hopeless charge, than my learned friend. But let him get up something like a solid phalanx of reasoning to prove his Rule of Faith; let him prove the consubstantiality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; let him prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; let him prove the baptism of infants; let him prove that he is not flying in the face of the Lord God Jehovah, by having the daring arrogance to depart from the strict words of the Bible, in keeping the Sabbath; let him prove that it is lawful (the mode of celebrating the Sabbath having been of old most indisputably to continue it from Friday evening until Saturday evening, as it is among the Jews at present); let him prove, I say, that it is a *valid keeping of it*, to confine it to one day. Let him bring forward some

clear, irrefragable text, to justify this curtailment of time in its weekly celebration. No, my friends, the moment he threw down the Bible in that flouncing and ostentatious manner on the table, which ye all witnessed, that moment I thought within myself, "Friend, in thy arguments thou art a *dead man* this evening." [Laughter.] Yes, my friends, *he* will go out of this room to-night, wearing high on his head the glittering laurels of a showy eloquence, and applauded by every one of the supporters of his fallacious system; but he will go

out *in truth*, his conscience stinging him with the thought, that he has had to argue with a *logical argumentator*. Gentlemen, my time is up!

The meeting then separated in a very orderly manner, at about half-past ten o'clock.

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,

Reporter.

TENTH EVENING, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1839.

SUBJECT:

RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued.)

Rev. J. CUMMING rose and said, in reply to Mr. French's observations:—

Before, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I make any remarks upon the subject that is more immediately under review, I must say, in reply to the explanatory observations of my learned antagonist, that when a meeting was held by the Reformation Society, on the subject of "Roman Catholic error," and in favour of the great and good objects of that Society, whose desire it is to discountenance and to refute Roman Catholic error, and establish in its place scriptural and Catholic truth, it was then stated that the members of the deputation were prepared to meet *any Roman Catholic priest*, in order to discuss the principles that are at issue. I refused to meet a *layman*, on the simple ground that we had found it generally to be the case, that after

we had *exterminated* his arguments and remarks, we were met with this objection by the priests of the Church of Rome—"Oh, you have only replied to an *unauthorized* layman, who has no weight, no permission, and no authority: his arguments go for nothing in the estimate of the Church." On this ground alone my objection rested. I thought that this had terminated all prospect of a discussion. But certain friends—Protestant friends—connected with Hammersmith, waited upon me, and stated that Mr. French, patronized by some priests, had been expounding the Roman Catholic Faith, and that he had frequently thrown out challenges to "those superficial individuals" who had appeared to advocate the principles of the Protestant Church. My reply on that occasion was,—“I have told you

already, distinctly and publicly, that I object to meet an unauthorized layman; but if Mr. French," (who, I subsequently learned, was a scholar and a barrister,) "will obtain the written permission and authority of his priest, I shall gladly and willingly meet him." However, the Protestants said,—“Really, he is making such statements, as to require some person to come forward and expose, not only their fallacy, but also the daring assumptions they involve.” [A laugh from Mr. French.] I said,—“No: we must have the sanction of his priest or some one of the Romish bishops, and then I will come forward and gladly meet him.” But, on looking over a report of a meeting of the Roman Catholic Institute, I find, in the first place, by the rules of the committee, that “every member of the committee”—for instance, Mr. Kendal (the Catholic chairman), Mr. French, or Mr. Andrews, who are members of that Institute—“that every member of the Catholic Institute” is *authorized* by that Institute, at the head of which are the bishops and priests of the Church of Rome, “to hold meetings for the furtherance of the objects of that Institute.” They are *authorized*, you see—Mr. French among the rest—authorized to hold meetings for the furtherance of the Institute. Every one knows *what* the objects of the Institute are. In the second place, Mr. French is, *de facto*, a preacher, or expositor of the Roman Catholic faith; his *de jure* orders his Church can determine. At the Windsor Castle he has given successive lectures.—I don’t know whether Mr. French is ordained, or whether the Windsor Castle* is duly consecrated

[laughter]; but he, as an individual member of the committee of the Catholic Institute, is so far possessed of episcopal authority. And, thirdly, he has, rightly or wrongly, entered on the office of expositor of the Roman Catholic faith, and, on that account, I said,—“My objections now very much vanish.” I said,—“I am ready to meet him, first, as an *expositor* of the Roman Catholic faith; secondly, as a *member* of the committee of the Roman Catholic Institute, sanctioned and *authorized* to hold meetings by the very constitution of that Institute; and, in the last place, to my inexpressible delight, he is sanctioned and authorized by, as you have seen, *two*, and sometimes *four* priests, evening after evening, giving their countenance and *aid* to my antagonist.

MR. FRENCH—[eagerly].—No: not aid. No such thing!

REV. J. CUMMING.—[in continuation]—And I certainly rejoice to see these reverend gentlemen, and to find them in the field. But what still confirms me in the impression is, that Mr. French is in every way qualified to enter into the discussion. I must say it is by no means a discredit to Mr. French. He has made the ablest defence of his creed that I have ever heard. He has done nobly; the only misfortune is, that he has to advocate an unscriptural cause. Had he my cause, and I his, I believe he would beat me hollow. [Laughter.]

Now, then, I again repeat to him my challenge:—If, when I have done with Mr. French, although fatigued and worn out with fixed clerical duties that devolve upon me, if he pleases to invite any priest, or bishop, or cardinal, or even the Pope himself, when he comes to consecrate the new Roman Catholic cathedral in London [a

* The name of the room in which Mr. French gave his first Lecture in Hammer-smith.

rumour of this nature was abroad at the time]—if it please him to invite any one of them over, I shall be prepared to discuss all the principles and differences at issue between us; and if his Holiness will condescend to honour the British School-room at Hammersmith with his august presence, I shall be delighted to discuss with him, *vis à vis*, the controverted points of this question. [Laughter.] Let me add that, before the discussion, Mr. French did obtain the authorization of the priests.

In directing you, you remember, to the comparative merits of the Protestant and Roman Catholic versions of the sacred Scriptures, I stated that, if our version be so erroneous as my opponent has represented it, it is an extraordinary and, to me, an inexplicable phenomenon, that the Roman Catholic version of the Bible has, day by day, and year by year, *approximated* to our version, as if ours were the standard of perfection. To convince you that this is not mere assertion, but positive fact, I quote, first, from the earliest editions of the Rhemish Testament, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, viii. 18:—"Not *condign* to the glory to come." Next I quote from the Protestant Bible:—"Not *worthy to be compared* with the glory." And now I quote Archbishop Murray's Bible, the Romish edition at this day, and the same edition as my friend has in his hand:—"Not worthy to be compared with the glory." Here you will observe, that the Rhemish original has the translation "not *condign* to the glory to come;" our Protestant version takes the proper rendering, "not worthy to be compared with the glory;" and the Romish version, now put forth by the Romish priesthood, abandons the rendering authorized by its

parent of Rheims, and wisely conforms to the just and faithful translation adopted by the Protestant Church.

In Hebrews i. 9, the ancient Rhemish stands thus:—"We see not as yet all things subject to him, but him that was a little lessened under the angels. We see Jesus, because of the passage of death, crowned with glory and honour, that through the grace of God he might taste death for all."

The same passage in the Protestant, or authorized Bible, is—"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

Next I quote from Dr. Murray's Bible, or the modern Douay version, in the hands of Roman Catholics:—"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour."

Here, again, the Archbishop rejects the original Rhemish translation, and adopts our authorized translation; a second testimony to his conviction, that the Roman Catholic version approaches perfection precisely as it approaches ours.

Again, 1 Peter i. 25, from the old Roman Catholic version:—"But the word of our Lord remaineth for ever; and this is the word that is evangelized among you."

The Protestant version is:—"But the word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word, which by the Gospel is preached unto you."

Then the modern Douay Bible, having Dr. Murray's imprimatur attached thereto, is:—"But the word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word, which by the Gospel has been preached unto you."

Thus, again, he *rejects* the original Rhemish translation, which was the original standard of the Church of Rome, and has recourse to the version of the Protestant Bible, which is abominable to Mr. French, but lovely to Dr. Murray. Others might be produced to show that though it may be marvellously convenient for my opponent to talk of the errors of the Protestant version of the Bible, yet let him know it is a fact, which I am prepared to demonstrate by still further evidence, that the very Bible he holds in his hands is every year *approximating* to the translation which is adopted in the Protestant Church, as furnished in the reign of King James in 1611. In other words, the Church of Rome grows wiser.

You recollect, that in the course of the remarks of my learned opponent, he called on me to prove the change of the Sabbath. His position was, that the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day could not be substantiated without the aid of tradition. Now, the first question is, *Why keep the Sabbath at all?* I answer, That it is a part of the moral law. It was observed before the ceremonial ritual of the Jews was in existence. It was kept in the wilderness, and the very *word* with which our fourth commandment begins, "*remember,*" implies the observance of an institution which was previously in existence.

The second question is, *Why not keep the Jewish Sabbath, namely, the seventh day?* I answer, The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, distinctly absolves us from the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; and Bellarmine, the Roman Catholic advocate, admits that these and other Scriptures have absolved us from keeping the Jewish Sabbath.

In the third place, *Why keep it on the first day of the week?* The answer is, We are bound by the *moral law* to keep the Sabbath; we are bound by the New Testament to let go the seventh day; and the *Apostles and primitive Christians*, as recorded in the Bible, kept it on *the first day*. Thus I have shown, without having recourse to the aids of Papal or legendary tradition, that it is the express, and direct, and irrefragable inference from sacred writ, that the Sabbath should be kept on the first day of the week.

MR. FRENCH.—The reference to Bellarmine? [To Mr. Cumming.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—The passage I quoted last was not from Bellarmine. I said Bellarmine admits that the Scriptures absolve us from keeping the Sabbath; and, in the third place, that the first day of the week was the day, as proved by various instances among the apostles and primitive Christians, universally observed.

The reiterated statement of my antagonist was, How can you prove the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, and his consubstantiality with the Father and the Son, without the aid of his clerical tradition? Again, I reply to this, first, that the personality of the Holy Spirit is proved by the fact that he is spoken of in Scripture as "*tempted,*" as "*vexed,*" as "*grieved,*" as "*being sent*"—expressions applicable to a person only. He is furthermore described in Scripture as calling the apostles, and as "*distributing gifts,*" as "*speaking expressly,*" as "*giving utterance,*" as "*making intercession;*" and lastly, the baptismal form is, "*in the NAME of the Father,*" which is a person, "*the Son,*" which is a person, and, by consistency and parity of reasoning, the "*Holy Ghost,*" which is *also a person*. Thus I prove the *personality*

of the Holy Spirit. He next asks me to prove the *procession* of the Holy Spirit. My reference to that is the Gospel of St. John, xiv. 26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Thus the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son. He comes from the Son ("I will send,") but previously to that he comes from the Father; and therefore that text which (mind you) is quoted by the Roman Catholic professor, Dr. Delahogue, to prove the very same thing—that text proves that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and the Father. I give this as a reply to his question, "How can you prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from Scripture?"

[The rev. gentleman, on discovering an error he had made in his last reference, thus rectified it:] I find it is the fifteenth chapter of John, and twenty-sixth verse; I made a mistake in saying it was the fourteenth. The words in the Douay version are—"But when the Paraclete cometh, whom *I will send you from the Father*, the Spirit of Truth, who *proceedeth from the Father*, he shall give testimony of me." And the NOTE in the Douay Bible on *this very text is, the acknowledgment of Mr. French's own Church* that Scripture alone proves this procession without troubling tradition. Hear your Church's note, Mr. French, and be silent on this head for ever:—

"John xv. 26. This *proves*, against the modern Greeks, that the Holy Ghost PROCEEDETH FROM THE SON AS WELL AS FROM THE FATHER, otherwise he could not be sent by the Son."

When I say this text proves the point he demands, he replies, It does not prove it; but when his Church

says so, *then*, he says, It does prove it.

You will then observe, that the *very* argument I am now using is repeated in a note in the Douay Bible, which states distinctly that by this text the Holy Spirit *proceeds* from the Father and the Son. Now, Mr. French will recollect that last evening he had the temerity to assert that my reasoning on the subject was most illogical. Now, if I am reasoning illogically, then it follows that the notes appended to his own version of the Bible are illogical also. Here is Roman Catholic unity! Dr. Murray against Mr. French, and Mr. French most justly denouncing the logic of his own Church. My opponent excels all controversialists I ever met with, in the sweeping extermination he deals around him on doctors, councils, cardinals, &c. &c.

But what a correct church is this of Rome, to profess to give her children infallible comments, which Mr. French, a member of the committee of the Catholic Institute, patronized by bishops and cherished by the Pope, solemnly and deliberately declares to be illogical!

The next question my opponent asked was, How I could prove the deity of Christ without the aid of his tradition. He said the Socinian would reply, "The Father is *greater* than I." Now, you recollect my observation upon that was, that the very statement—"My Father is greater than I"—is, in my mind, an announcement which at once implies, that Christ was greater than man: because we cannot conceive that a mere human creature would stand up and announce the extraordinary truism, "My Father is *greater* than I."

But I must show you that the Scriptures are by no means silent on the Deity of Christ. The very re-

verse is the fact. The Scriptures more than adequately demonstrate his eternal Godhead and Divinity. For instance, "He thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*." And again—"All men should honour the *Son even as they honour the Father*." "The glorious appearing of Jesus Christ, our great God and Saviour." "This (Jesus Christ) is the true God and eternal life."

The next question related to the *evidence* of Scripture. How could you prove, he asks, the Bible without the aid of tradition? Now, again, I wish to make a few remarks on this subject. My ingenious antagonist has a very quiet way of trying to mystify your minds; he is most anxious, you observe, to lead you to believe that Romish *unwritten ecclesiastical traditions* and *historical testimony* are to be placed on a par, and on precisely the same foundation. Now, no misapprehension can be greater in his mind, and no statement can reach yours of a more gross or delusive tendency. *We* hold the evidence of history to be most *valuable*: if we reject the testimony of history the past is a blank; we regard many historical writers as admirable *authorities for facts*, whom we do not regard as infallible *expositors of doctrine*. For instance, in a Roman Catholic magazine, the other week, the editor has spoken of "the tremendous defeat" which Mr. Cumming has experienced in the course of this discussion [laughter], and they have given a very luminous description of some of the doctrinal views brought forward on the different occasions. Now, I hold the Roman Catholic *Orthodox Journal* to be a very sufficient authority for the simple fact, that a discussion is carried on at Hamersmith, in such and such a place, and at such and such a time; but that does not imply that I am to take it

as an infallible expositor either of the *doctrines* contained in the word of God, or of the side which is victorious. Now, it is in just the same way I would treat the fathers and historians who have written at preceding periods of the world. As *authorities for facts* they are most valuable; as *expositors of the doctrines* of Christianity, as I shall show more and more, they are the most conflicting and contradictory, though most frequently opposed to the Roman Church. But if he [Mr. French] shall still persist in asking how I prove Scripture without tradition, I must repeat what I said last evening—that it would take me, on the most moderate calculation, at least six weeks to lay before you a perfect series of proofs relative to the evidences of Christianity. Still my opponent, to save Romanism by bringing in the Infidel controversy, repeats his question—How do you prove Scripture without tradition?—meaning (keep a clear idea of *terms*) by tradition, the *unwritten word*—(mind you, *documents which he cannot produce*, which I challenge him to *produce*, which, however, he knows it is *impossible* to produce). The *first* proof I have already given, the *external evidence*—history, *miracles*, and *prophecy*: these alone are decisive. There is, *secondly*, *internal evidence* of a no less decisive character. There is, *thirdly*, *experimental evidence*, which I shall not bring forward on the present occasion, for I believe that is an argument not appreciated in arguing with a Roman Catholic opponent. But hear one plain matter of fact. There may be in this assembly—at this stage of the evening's discussion—to take the lowest calculation, four hundred individuals: two hundred of these are Protestants. I ask of these two hundred, Are you not persuaded in

your minds that the Bible is inspired? are you not satisfied that it is authentic? are you not sure as assurance can make you that it is genuine? Well, how did you come to this conclusion? by what process have you reached it? You repudiate tradition—you scorn the assumptions of the Papacy—you treat both as “old wives’ fables,” and yet you are satisfied that the Bible is inspired, authentic, and genuine. One fact is preferable to twenty syllogisms. This one simple fact, received on the part of two hundred individuals, who are perfectly unanimous in rejecting the traditions of the Roman Church, and have therefore reached it without the aid of tradition, is irrefragable demonstration that it is perfectly possible, as it is very common, to attain an assured conviction that the Bible is the word of God, and the inspiration of the Spirit, without the unwritten word or lying legends of the Western Apostasy.

In the next place I refer to *prophecy* for one powerful and invincible argument in favour of the inspiration of Scripture. Let me refer you to the prophecies respecting our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Isaiah describes one feature, Jeremiah describes another, Malachi a third, Moses a fourth, and so on. Now, you will observe, their respective features of our Lord are apparently so contradictory, as they are disclosed in their several prophecies, without the aid of the New Testament light to reconcile them, that you would say that, if an individual should appear in the lapse of ages answering to all these apparently contradictory predictions, these prophets will thereby be proved to have been inspired. I may refer to the Apollo Belvidere statue, —well known as the bust of Apollo, one of the greatest masterpieces of

ancient statuary—as a case that exactly illustrates my point. Suppose an arm had been made at Rome, a leg at Athens, the head in London, the nose at Paris, the mouth at Edinburgh, the ears again in New South Wales, and a toe in New Zealand or some other part of the world; but, on bringing all these marble fragments together in this room, they all so exactly suited, harmonized, and dovetailed with each other, that, when joined, they formed the magnificent statue I have named—at once the admiration of the world, and the most splendid production of the human chisel—what would you infer? Would you not naturally say that a presiding statuary had superintended the movement of every chisel, applied a mysterious measurement to every member, and adjusted by a great standard every lineament, and so guided each artist that while he understood not he yet erred not? They worked as they were moved and directed by the presiding and superintending power. Now this is one of the processes by which I prove the prophets to be inspired, and Christianity to be divine. Christ is the perfect man, the prophets the statuarys, and the Holy Ghost the moving and directing mind. We find, when their respective delineations, various and seemingly antagonistic features and characteristics of the Son of God come to be brought together, they are all found at once to meet and to harmonize in the Lord of glory—the express image of the Father; and to give in this fact the impressive demonstration, that “they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

I might illustrate the inspiration of the New Testament by the fact that the apostles and evangelists themselves *claim* to be inspired; so

that either they are impostors the most gross, or they are inspired writers the most infallible: there is no other alternative; one or the other they must be. I might also refer, in the next place, to the second Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, which describes the great apostasy which should appear in the lapse of ages, describing one "who sits in the temple of God, above all that is called God, saying that he is God;" or when the seer of Patmos records that this great apostasy was to appear on *seven hills*—the characteristic of Rome—that it was to be called Babylon, "the great mystery"—"the abomination that maketh desolate"—that its power was to spread "from the rivers to the ends of the earth," and that all nations, more or less, were to be brought under its gigantic and contaminating power, and to be made drunkards with its cup. I might take, also, the predictions of this overshadowing apostasy from the second of Thessalonians, from the Apocalypse, or from the Epistle of Paul to Timothy, where it is spoken of as commanding men to "abstain from meats, which God has required to be received with thanksgiving"—where it speaks of discountenancing marriage, which is honourable among all, priests and people. I might take these evidences, and bring them together, and prove that their exact counterpart is the Church of which my opponent is so courageous an advocate; and that, therefore, the very existence of the Roman Catholic superstition is a most decisive evidence of the inspiration of the apostles and evangelists of the New Testament. I might stake their inspiration upon this alone—it is so broad and so legible. If transferred to the "Hue and Cry," the Pope would be imprisoned next week,

provided a reward were offered for his apprehension. To confirm this evidence, suppose a lock were made by Bramah or Chubb, or some other ingenious locksmith, the most intricate in its wards you are able to conceive; you bring a key that exactly fits everyward, enters perfectly into every crevice, and draws the bolt and gives you admission—you instantly say, the workman who contrived the lock must have also formed or foreseen the key that so perfectly opens it, or, *vice versa*, the one is made for the other. Now so I say here: there is the lock, or intricate portrait of the Romish Church, described by the apostles and evangelists; in the sacred page there is a description of the key, which meets and answers to all the lock's most intricate wards. The apostles laid down the lock, at the time too intricate to be opened. Man's wickedness presents Popery, the key which perfectly opens it.

Having made these remarks on the evidences of the inspiration of Scripture, let me remind you of one dilemma which Mr. French is disposed to gloss over, not certainly to solve. He asks and asks again, How are you able to prove Scripture without the Church? Now, I retaliate by asking, How can you prove the Church?—where do you find it? He answers, By the Scripture? Then I ask next, How do you prove the Scripture? He answers, By the Church.

MR. FRENCH—[quick and loudly] I do not.

REV. J. CUMMING.—No; but your Church does, and *must* do so. [A laugh.] But, if Mr. French objects to *that* answer, the audience will wait for *his* answer. [The rev. gentleman, turning to Mr. French, here paused a moment.]

MR. FRENCH.—Do you mean now?—an answer now?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No; it does not matter now—when you rise will do. Let me repeat, I ask him, Where and how does he prove his Church? He or his Church answers, By and from the Bible. I ask him, Where does he find and how does he prove the Bible? He answers, From and by the Church. And thus, by a *petitio principii*, the most discreditable to a logician of his claims and pretensions, by a kind of most tortuous and circular argumentation, worthy of my learned opponent, he lands at the splendid assumption—that you have no Bible without the Church, and no Church without the Bible; and, in short, you must plunge into all the depths of the most disastrous scepticism, or extinguish common sense and common judgment, in order to be a Roman Catholic. The Romish Church allows you to exercise your faculties in every province but one. The moment you reach her threshold, you must put out your senses, quench your reason, and take in only what she doles out. Strange mystery of iniquity! It fears nothing but light, hates nothing but holiness, and flees from nothing but truth. Bad logic does not abash her, worse morality does not humble her, God's judgment only will consume her. Suppose, to cast light on Roman assumptions, a person were to come forward to the House of Lords and Commons, and say—"You are incessantly involved in disputes—you want a tribunal able to settle all your differences. I must assume the reins of the empire; I must sit on the throne and administer the laws; and my authority for doing so is contained in *Magna Charta*." And he says—this usurper says—"I will show you by *Magna Charta* that all your monarchs previously have done

wrong for want of allegiance to me. I am, therefore, come to assume the reins of government and put all right." Suppose, now, after he had sat on the throne two years, that he was to begin to interdict trial by jury, to repress the right of free discussion and the utterance of free thought—suppose that he was to interfere with British freedom and British liberties to a most unprecedented extent, and in a way the most tyrannical and cruel; and suppose that a deputation from the Lords and Commons waited on his *soi-disant* majesty, and said to him, "Sire, you profess to sit on the throne in virtue of the prescriptions of *Magna Charta*, but you have violated every one of its provisions; you have acted on a system altogether foreign to the spirit and most destructive to the principles of *Magna Charta*, and we therefore insist that you shall abandon the throne as an usurper, and not as a legitimate king." Suppose this usurper were to say, "Soldiers! put irons on these men's hands, and on these men's feet. How dare you question my royal prerogative? Are you not aware, my lords and gentlemen," he would say, "that *Magna Charta* is not 'worth a snuff'—[laughter]—until I have given it my imprimatur, my royal authority? It is not worth any thing until I have given it the authority of the crown, and personally recognised it as binding on you. My imprimatur makes it *Magna Charta*. The absence of it leaves it a blank sheepskin." "Sire," they reply, "we understood you assumed the reins of government '*in virtue*' of the prescriptions of *Magna Charta*, and on grounds presented by it alone. You are and must be destitute of all authority without it, for you professed at first to derive your

authority directly in virtue of the provisions of Magna Charta." Now, what would you say of such a monarch? You would say, he must have some questionable ends and some curious policy in such conduct, and an addled understanding in relying on such reasoning. Charity herself must say of such a monarch, that the fool and the fiend, a weak head and a bad heart, must compose his character. I say to the Pope, solemnly and emphatically, "THOU ART THE MAN." He claims his place in *virtue* of the Bible, at the moment he violates and insults it; and when you go and tell him that Purgatory is not in the Bible, that the Mass is not in the Bible, that the Invocation of Saints is not in the Bible, that Transubstantiation is not in the Bible, he replies,— "How dare you make such objections?—[laughter]—the Bible is no authority without *my* seal and superscription—without my imprimatur it is a *vox et præterea nihil*." Then you naturally, as a Protestant, immediately reply to his Holiness,—"If the Bible is nothing without your authority, how comes it to pass that originally you professedly *based* your authority on the *statements* of the Bible? It seems to have authority when it suits your purpose, but none when it is against you." "Inquisitors," replies the Pope, in most conclusive logic, "collect the faggots—prepare an *auto da fê*." Roman Catholics, in fact, are destitute of any *practical* Rule of Faith at all, and, unhappy men! they know it; but, alas! they are dazzled by magnificent, by empty and rapid assumptions; and under these *ignes fatui* they are plundered of the only guide to heaven and a happy immortality. They are told by my opponent, The Church is infallible, and they fancy it proved by the words of St. Matthew, xviii. 17, "Hear

the Church." But when I fairly examine these words and the contiguous verses, I find that the phrase relates to private quarrels among Christians, having no relation to doctrines of theology; and, if it be a precedent for anything, it must be a precedent for this—that if two Roman Catholics in this assembly choose to fall out, the Pope ought to summon instantly a council of the whole Church to decide this petty squabble, and announce his fiat from the Vatican or the chair of St. Peter, which is right and which is wrong. The Pope's post would be no sinecure. You still, nevertheless, hold there is an infallible *living* tribunal, and that this tribunal is a competent guide unto all truth, and I must hear the Church. I ask, WHERE SHALL I FIND IT? I go to your *priest*, and your priest says,— "I am not infallible, I am liable to err." I go to your *bishop*, and he says—"I am not infallible, I am liable to err." And yet, I say, you told me to "hear the Church." Well, I want to hear it; your *priests* will not let me hear it, your *bishops* will not let me hear it; they say they are not living infallibles. Where am I to go? I go to the *Pope*, but Mr. French says he is not infallible. Then, where am I to go? I go to the Creed of Pope Pius IV., but it is a fallible production of a fallible man, namely, of a Pope. I go to the notes in your version of the Bible, but Dr. Doyle said, before the House of Lords and Commons, "they are no authority whatever;" and you and he are unanimous for once. Now, here I stand; I want to "hear the Church" and to get at infallible truth, but I cannot. Your priests cannot let me hear it; your bishops cannot; your notes in your authorized version of the Bible are of no authority; your Pope's infal-

libility is true here and false there. I want still to "hear the Church." Pray, what am I to do? Where and what is this living infallible guide? Shall I refer to the fathers? They contradict themselves, as I told you, in every page; and before you can ascertain what their sentiments are, you will have, as I told you before, to fill a cart with their ponderous folios, and read Greek and Latin in the British Museum for some seven or eight years, and, after all the toil and the trouble, ascertain nothing like the opinion of the Church, for they differ from themselves and differ from the Church, and my opponent differs from both. I implore you, my Roman Catholic friends, "be not deceived" by these pretences, for you are very bitterly deceived. You hear a man putting forth the most arrogant and brilliant assumptions about the Church—her antiquity, her sanctity, her apostolicity, her infallibility; but when a poor creature goes and tells his priest, "I want to hear this Church," you will find she is inaudible except in deeds of proscription and of ruin, invisible except to mischief, mighty to mislead, and impotent to good.

Again, Mr. French asked last night, How we can come to possess the Scriptures at all without the Church handing them down to us? And he alleged, that if we take the Scriptures from the hands of the Church, we are bound also to take her *exposition* of the Scripture given by the Roman Catholic Church. I will give my opponent my full reply from his once loved, but now rejected Augustine, namely, that a blind man may carry a mirror in his hand that will disclose his own wrinkles, while he himself is unable to use it. Also, let me add, the dirtiest hand you can

imagine may hold the most brilliant light. So it is with the Church of Rome. She carries a mirror in which she, from her own blindness, cannot see her own features, but to him whose eyes are open it clearly portrays "the mystery of iniquity." The Church of Rome may be the instrument in God's hand of holding out the Bible to surrounding nations, whilst she herself may be "dead in trespasses and sins." But there is a decisive reply to this illogical reasoning: you are aware that the Jews, to whom they were committed, handed down the oracles of God to Christ and his apostles, while the same Jews that did so not only had made void the law by tradition, but *crucified* the Lord of glory, and said with murderous and with unanimous accents — "Not this man, but Barabbas." If my opponent's logic is good, then, because these Jews handed down the Scriptures to Christ and his followers, our Lord and the apostles were bound to take their *expositions* of them; *inter alia*, of the 53rd of Isaiah, or their carnal views of the Messiah, and the nature of the moral law; and thus the Talmud, Mishna, and Gemara, must be truer than the New Testament.

My opponent next made a number of quotations, as usual, concerning the differences of Protestant writers. My opponent quoted a variety of garbled extracts from Luther and Calvin, and from various other early writers at the Reformation, from the earliest period down to the present. In the first place, I exceedingly *suspect* the accuracy and honesty of *all the quotations*, not because I doubt his honesty, but because I have had already so many strong proofs of his peculiar infirmity in giving extracts.—[Tittering.] You recollect he quoted a passage from

St. Augustine, and suddenly stopped short; but the moment that I followed up the quotation and gave you the *rest* of the passage, we found that St. Augustine spoke totally opposite from the meaning attached to him by my learned opponent. You will remember also that he quoted from Sir Edwin Sandys what Sir Edwin never meant to say, and what Sir Edwin abhorred. He wished you to infer that Sir Edwin Sandys was a zealous admirer of the Roman Catholic Church; but when I went to Sir Edwin Sandys according to my opponent's reference, I found him to be a zealous anti-Romanist, writing the very reverse of my opponent's extract. You recollect also he has frequently quoted Malachi ii. 7:—"The priest's lips shall keep knowledge, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts;" but he always *omits*, by some unaccountable oversight—[a laugh]—the eighth verse, namely, "but *ye* (*i.e.* the priests) have *deserted* (or gone astray from) the truth;" so that, finding from experience that Mr. French is constantly *in the habit of making these sad mistakes* about the words and meaning of different writers, and *instinctively falling into misquotations the most erroneous and extravagant*, I do say with reason that I SUSPECT EVERY QUOTATION HE MAKES. Let him give the chapter, the verse, or the reference, and enable me to verify; not that I hold that any extracts from fallible men, Protestant or Papal, can touch our Rule of Faith. Errors in the Gospels and contradictions in the Epistles must be found before our Rule suffers. I could not follow, nor do I care to follow his irrelevant references. As a *sample*, however, of my opponent's universal knack in making Protestant quotations make Romish or Infidel faces, I

refer to his extract from Latimer, in which my opponent represented Latimer as having said that Christ "descended into hell and bore its torments." Now, I had great difficulty in getting at this passage, and at last I discovered it, not through his (Mr. French's) reference, but by the kind searching of a friend. Hear Latimer's remark:

"I see no inconvenience to say that Christ suffered in soul in hell. I singularly commend the exceeding great charity of Christ, who, for our sakes, would suffer in hell in his soul."

These were the words quoted by my opponent, and at these he stopped short; but, *with wonted treachery of memory*, I trust, and not deliberate garbling, he *forgot* to add what Latimer adds:

"If what I have spoken of Christ's suffering in the garden and in hell derogate any thing from Christ's death and passion, AWAY WITH IT, BELIEVE ME NOT IN THIS. If you like not that which I have spoken of his sufferings, let it go. I will not strive in it; I will be a prejudice to nobody; weigh it as ye list; I do but offer it to you to consider."—*Sermon on the Passion of Christ*. This is a sample of Mr. French's honesty, or memory. These sentiments of Latimer are truly Protestant. The bishop sinks his opinion in that of sacred writ; he does not wish to put it forward as a dogma. He wishes you to go to the Bible, and try and test it by the records of truth. But my learned friend found it marvellously convenient to *quote the first sentence*, but *to leave out the explanation which follows in the very same passage*. Now, having had such mournful experience of his repeated misquotations, and of the infirmities of human nature in making extracts from fallible documents—[a laugh]

I say, *I do exceedingly doubt the correctness of most of the quotations he has made*, and I only now request THAT, WHEN THE DISCUSSION IS PRINTED, HE WILL GIVE THESE REFERENCES, WITH CHAPTER AND VERSE, and I will expiscate them.

He quoted Luther, saying, along with Cardinal Cajetan, be it remembered, that the Epistle of St. James was not inspired; Calvin says something else was not inspired. And if Luther, or Cajetan, or Calvin said so, I do not vindicate them; neither they nor their writings are any part of my Rule of Faith—their expositions are not Gospels or inspired Epistles. I only add, neither Latimer nor Luther is my Pope; neither is, or claimed to be infallible. My opponent's Rule of Faith, you must not forget, is *threefold*. First, SCRIPTURE, and second, TRADITION, and third, THE EXPOSITIONS OF THE CHURCH. When, as I have often done, I show the contradictions, and absurdities, and blasphemies of *Tradition*, and of the *Expositions of the Church*, I break up his Rule of Faith. My Rule of Faith is THE BIBLE ALONE. When, therefore, he exposes Calvin, and Luther, and Latimer, he does not touch my Rule of Faith; it remains inviolate. He rather confirms it, by showing all human writings to be fallible, and apostles and evangelists alone infallible.

Better that Protestants should occasionally err in interpreting the Scriptures, than be Romanists, and be forbidden to use them. The Bull *Unigenitus* condemns the perusal of Scripture—a bull which Dr. Murray has declared on oath to be part and parcel of the law for the Irish Church. The Bull *Unigenitus* declares that “women are not to read the Bible, and that the laity are not (in the vulgar tongue) to peruse the Scriptures.” And you are aware that Dr. Doyle, when he

heard that a Roman Catholic priest had burned a Protestant Bible, most magnanimously said, “If I knew”—

Mr. FRENCH.—Pshaw!

GEORGE FINCH, Esq.—[said to Mr. Cumming.]—Not burned, but *buried*!

Mr. FRENCH—[as we understood.]—To be sure—*buried*.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Very well, I stand corrected by the chair; the difference does not affect my point. He said of the Protestant who *buried* the Bible in the earth, that if “he knew that Protestant, he would publicly reward him.” The difference between *burying* and *burning* the Bible is most immaterial. It matters not whether a man buries or burns it; the fact I wish to show is, that Dr. Doyle approved of the most nefarious treatment of the Holy Scriptures, on the part of Roman Catholics in Ireland, and pronounced it meritorious to hide the word of God. Moreover, let me add, that Luther, so far from opposing the Bible, translated the Bible, and circulated it through various parts of the continent, and became by that means the instrument of great and abounding good.

But with respect to the diversities which he has professed to find out among Protestant writers, my opponent himself knows well that he has discovered a “mare’s nest,” that is, by interpretation, nothing at all.—[Laughter.] I must repeat, if I had asserted the definition of my Rule of Faith to be the Bible *expounded by Luther and Calvin*, or any other of the Reformers—if my Rule of Faith at all consisted of the sentiments they uttered, then, indeed, Mr. French’s objections would be fatal. But I said no such thing, I gave no such definition. I stated again and again, “THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE, IS THE RULE OF FAITH TO PROTESTANTS.” And,

therefore, though he were to show all the Protestants in Christendom knocking their heads against each other, he would still not have shown that the Scriptures were either insufficient or imperfect as a Rule of Faith. But pray, mark the important distinction—when I show the diversities among the doctors and fathers and traditions of the Roman Catholic Church, I strike at the very foundation and substance of the Romish Rule of Faith. When he (Mr. French) shows Protestants differing among themselves as recorded in their writings at early periods, he does not touch the Protestant Rule of Faith. He confirms the Protestant position—man is fallible, God's word is perfect. When I show the greatest diversity obtaining among the fathers and doctors and traditions of the Roman Catholic Church, I strike at the very foundation, and destroy the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith.

Now I repeat this, because I want you distinctly to see, that if Mr. French, in the course of this night's discussion, show you, as he probably will, or on any preceding night, he has shown you, that Luther, or Calvin, or Knox, or Melanethon, hold sentiments in any jot or tittle antagonistic and contradictory, he is to remember that Luther was not an evangelist, that Calvin never claimed inspiration, that neither Knox nor Melanethon were apostles, and that, when he shall have shown their differences, not merely to be what they are, but tenfold, he has by no means shown that the *Scriptures* are *insufficient* as a Rule of Faith. I contend, therefore, that Mr. French, in bringing forward the differences of opinion which were cherished among Protestant divines at an early period, has done nothing either to touch, or weaken, or de-

stroy, our Rule of Faith, he has only strengthened it and wasted his own time. And, therefore, when I heard him quoting (even if correctly) peculiar sentiments from one Reformer, and odd passages from another, I felt the sensation precisely of a man who sits in a well-built and comfortable house, and listens to the pattering of the rain drops and of the hailstones on the roof above him—[a laugh]—knowing that they cannot come through to hurt him, or interfere in the least with the safety of the house. But on the other hand, when he feels me smiting this illustrious cardinal, and exposing the contradictions of that erst-adored father, showing the inconsistencies of this tradition, and laying bare the idolatries, the superstitions and fanaticism of that council in the Roman Catholic Church, he and his compeers wince and wonder, for they know that I am striking at the very roots of the Romish religion, and that every blow that is dealt causes the dislodgment of some massive, but tottering stone in the top-heavy edifice of Papal wood, hay and stubble, under the shelter of which he professes to be safe. Now, keep this extenuating fact before you. Apply it, and smile as you hear my opponent's quotations. All the contradictions that may be shown to exist among professing Protestant writers do not *touch* our Rule of Faith, for "the Bible and the Bible alone" is our Rule of Faith. But on the other hand, the contradictions, fanaticisms, superstitions, and idolatries, which I have shown and will show to belong to Roman Catholic writers, expositors and doctors, strike at the very root of his Rule of Faith; and, having this idea clearly before you, you will know what value to attach to the extracts, inferences, and comments he shall

make on the subject. But as to Protestant differences and divisions, we never undertook to *guarantee* that there should be no differences among Protestants. I showed that heresies sprang up in the very noon-day of inspiration. I proved that schisms existed even in the times and presence of the apostles. I admit, also, that Protestants differ circumstantially; still, if they did so during the age of inspiration, much more will they now; but that they are nevertheless possessed of that "sevenfold and sacred unity" which I showed you on a previous occasion, and which their confessions, articles and writings also show. But the Rule of Faith held by Roman Catholics is pressed upon us, because they say it restores all to unity and order. It undertakes to *guarantee* that there shall be no differences. In showing diversities in the Romish Church, I show the Romish Rule has failed. We do not guarantee that there shall be no differences; but the Church of Rome does guarantee there should be no differences. And, therefore, when Mr. French has shown the differences which exist among professing Protestants, he has not done any thing to show that our Rule of Faith has not answered its end. But when I have shown differences, even in fundamentals as well as in circumstantials, in the Roman Catholic Church, I have shown that his Rule of Faith has failed to answer the end for which it was proclaimed; and, in fact, I will show this evening that the Church of Rome, while she puts forward the most splendid assumptions about her unity and unanimity, is torn and rent to the very centre by discords and diversities the most tremendous. She presents to a just inspection the aspect of the polar ocean. If you look at the polar

sea, it consists of an immense mass of ice, perpetual and undivided,—the sun's rays playing upon its surface throw over it a splendour the most beautiful, insomuch, that you would fancy from its appearance that it was one mighty mirror of waters, and that all was peace and serenity beneath, unbroken by a billow and unruffled by a breeze. But you have only to look below the surface of the vast mass of ice, through some transparency, or listen, and you will find that its depths are crowded with the most ferocious monsters of the deep—sharks and whales, and all unclean creatures of prey; that the ocean-ice conceals and shrouds beneath it the ever-restless elements of shipwreck, and that storm and tempest and convulsive agitations mingle in wild agony within it. Now, it is so with the Church of Rome. Outside is a crust of unity and unanimity, over which play around the coruscations of sunshine, splendid, dazzling and extravagant assumptions; but the moment you look into the "chambers of imagery within," you find discord and contrariety, contradiction and inconsistency, superstition and fanaticism, monstrous and extravagant. I have shown you, in making my remarks on the Protestant Rule of Faith, that if our diversities in non-essentials in the nineteenth century can tell against Protestants, then the diversities in the first century must tell against the claims of Christianity itself and the inspiration of the apostles. I have shown you, that our differences are in circumstantials and in non-essentials, but the differences of the Church of Rome are on vital, essential, and fundamental points. I have shown you that, in our Rule of Faith, we do not guarantee that there shall prevail unanimity of sentiment in

every matter of detail. All it guarantees is unanimity of sentiment on vital and essential truth, and this it does secure. But I have shown you that his rule (Mr. French's) undertakes to guarantee that there should be uniformity in all, and that, instead of preserving that uniformity, it has produced interminable discords, unsettled at the present hour, and never likely to be settled while the world lasts. Thus, when the Church of Rome comes to you and says—You Protestants are to renounce the Bible alone as your only Rule of Faith, and to embrace the only source of unity—"the written with the unwritten word, and both expounded by the Church," she wants you to exchange real freedom for its shadow—true unity for external and artificial quiet, the offspring of spiritual death. Her cup sparkles to the eye, but conveys poison to the soul. She promises what she well knows she cannot now, and never will be able to make good. Let me say, every specimen of contradiction among men which the Church of Rome can produce is only a fresh confutation of herself. All the differences which Mr. French has adduced on all the occasions he has spoken lead to this one most important lesson—a lesson I would he would learn—"WE MUST HAVE DONE WITH MAN." The mightiest names, and functions, and pretensions must sink and subside before the majesty of the oracles of God.

My opponent's extracts have, in fact, done my work. I thank my opponent for his able defence of my Rule of Faith. He has well shown, "cursed is the man that trusteth in an arm of flesh." He bids you Roman Catholics, in truth if not in word, leave the *ipse dixit* of popes and priests, and go "to the law and the testimony." The Romish doc-

tors and teachers, with the greatest pledges and promises of infallibility, I have proved guilty of the most extravagant and pernicious errors, and he has shown you men, professing to be reformers, and Protestants, and followers of Christ, of every age, who have also committed errors in some essential and in many subordinate matters. And now, let me ask of every discerning mind, what does all this teach? The sacred lesson—"if an angel from heaven were to preach any other Gospel" than that which we have received in the Bible, "he is to be *accursed*." We are to appeal from reformers to apostles, from Protestants to evangelists, from the Church unto Christ, from the fallibility of man to the infallibility of the Holy Spirit. Precious lesson!—more precious still if Mr. French and I have impressed it on a single conscience. I contend, therefore, that all he has made out is, the necessity of having done with man and having recourse to the word of God. Instead of pinning our faith to any man's creed, whatever be his name, whatever be his genius, whatever his assumptions, instead of assenting to council, or to cardinal, or to pope, we are to "search the Scriptures;" and if they, the greatest and most gifted, "speak not according to the law and the testimony," it is because "there is no light in them."

With these facts, then, I close. I had intended to have entered into an exposition of the gross inconsistencies that are embosomed in the very midst of the Rule of Faith of the Roman Catholic Church, even upon fundamental and essential points. [The reverend gentleman here inquired what residue of time was left him.] I find I have a few minutes left.

I now hold in my hand a pam-

phlet which I wrote and published myself, and, as Mr. French has frequently brought forward his own book, he will allow me to bring forward one sixpenny little pamphlet.

Mr. FRENCH.—Oh, certainly!

Mr. CUMMING.—[in continuation]—It is out of print, I am sorry to say, and cannot be purchased. In this pamphlet I have extracted from the creeds of all the reformed churches, their corporate expositions of the Gospel, and condensed them. On every vital truth, and in most circumstances, the English, Scottish, Belgian, Augsburg Confessions are as one. These only are the true expositions of Protestant faith, and not the opinions of individuals. Never forget this. For Protestant tenets we must go to Protestant confessions and to the Protestant Rule of Faith, the Bible, just as for Roman Catholic tenets we must go to Roman Catholic confessions and to the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, the Bible and tradition, and both propounded and expounded by the Church. These Protestant articles, when compared together, constitute the unity of Protestantism; they harmonize and coincide to a most striking extent. All is ecclesiastical and Christian unity. But, to show you from another source the contradictions and the jarring discords of the Church of Rome, I will quote the following portions of her rule.

“In this question (says Bellarmine), *whether, in case of heresy, the Pope may be judged and deposed, there are five different opinions.*”—Bellarmine, de Rom. Pontif. b. ii. c. 30, p. 317.

Again—“*Concerning the Pope's certainty of judgment there are four different opinions.*”—Book iv. c. 2, p. 473.

“*Not only heretics, but some*

Catholic doctors, have held Pope Honorius to have been a heretic.”—Book iv. c. 2, p. 519.

“*That particular Councils confirmed by the Pope cannot err, in faith and manners, there are some Catholics that deny, and yet not condemned as heretics by the Church.*”—De Conc. Aucto. b. ii. c. 5, p. 114.

“*Of the question, what manner of worship images are worthy of, there are three opinions—one, that the thing represented is to be worshipped before the image; the second, that the same honour is due to the image and the thing expressed by it; and the third, that images should be honoured, but with a less honour than the thing represented.*”—Bell. de Imag. Sanc. c. xx. p. 235.

“Some have held the seven last chapters of the Book of Esther not genuine, as Nicholas Lyra, D. Carthusianus, Sixtus Senensis.”—Bell. ch. vii. p. 30.

Now, observe, here is Cardinal Bellarmine asserting the inspiration of the Book of Esther, and here are three or four distinguished doctors of his Church saying it is not inspired; and lastly, Jerome, a father, it appears, comes forward and states expressly that it is not inspired; and yet Mr. French talks about the unity which exists in the Church of Rome.

Again, from Bellarmine—“The prayer of Christ for Peter's faith,” is expounded:—

“1. By the Parisian divines, that the Lord prayed for his universal Church or for Peter, as he bore the figure of the whole Church, *which exposition is false.*

“2. Others, who live at this day, that the Lord in this place prayed for the perseverance of Peter alone in the grace of God until the end, *confuted by four arguments.*

“3. The *third* exposition is true.” Bell. de R. P. b. iv. c. 3, p. 477.

Such is the unity of the Roman Church as admitted by Bellarmine.

"While I write this there is a great controversy among our writers about the kingdom of Christ."—*Bell. Recog.* p. 23.

"The last question is, whether God rewards good works of his mere liberality above their worthiness? The common opinion constantly affirms it, but Andrew Vega and the doctors of Louvain held the contrary."—*Bell. b. v. c. xix.* p. 471.

"Erasmus says, the Epistle of James does not savour of an apostolic Epistle. Cardinal Cajetan doubts of the authors of the Epistles of James and Jude. Bellarmine differs from both."—*Bell. b. i. c. xviii.* p. 86.

I solemnly declare there is nothing but doubts in the Church of Rome. My opponent boasts she is all unity and certainty in everything. I find her unity and certainty in nothing, save in answering to the Holy Spirit's portrait of the Antichristian Apostasy. So that, Roman Catholics, your own doctors are not agreed whether the Epistles of James and Jude are canonical books of the New Testament or not. Your Rule of Faith is suicidal. It canonizes and anathematizes the same subject and the same writer in the same breath. I am ready to resign all the accusations of Protestants on the subject of Roman Catholic diversity and discord. I am satisfied to place the whole question in the hands of Bellarmine. Let every Roman Catholic in this assembly read the admissions of the celebrated Cardinal—not the opinions only, but the facts and proofs and instances he adduces in every page, and he will see that there are not scars merely on the exterior coating, but rifts and rents in the very pith and

marrow of the Papal faith. Yours, my Roman Catholic hearers, is an awful and ruinous faith—it hoodwinks you, while it deceives and destroys your souls—it teaches you, by some of its doctors, and these most illustrious ones, to give to stocks and stones the honour due to God, in defiance of his laws—it destroys the perfect humanity of Christ, by making the Holy One of God a monster, according to the tenets of Transubstantiation, or plunging you into scepticism—it adds to the Scriptures, and adds, therefore, to you their solemn maledictions—it makes wicked men saints, and saint gods—it ransacks the dens of pandemonium to find deities for paradise. Your Church racks your consciences with unscriptural fears—absolves from sin and yet encourages it—she conjures into being purgatory to get your money—feeds you with husks of bread, and sends you to Mary instead of Jesus. Your Church mangles the solemn Eucharist, robs you of the cup, and casts you at the feet of shavelings; she cozens the crowd with traditions, pilgrimages, holy water, altars, crosses, tapers, &c. To show you contradictions in every element of the Roman Church, take any one subject; for instance, compulsory celibacy of the clergy was first publicly enjoined at the first Council of Lateran, A.D. 1123, but was expressly protested against by the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, the Council of Gangra, A.D. 340; which, I ask, is infallible? Again: the use of images and relics in public worship was first *publicly sanctioned* in the second Council of Nice, A.D. 787; but this was *condemned* by the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305; by Gregory the Great, A.D. 590, in "Epist. ad Serenum," ix. 9, 110. (*Labbe and Cossart*, v. 1370, 434); by the Council of Constantinople,

A.D. 754, and by the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794. Here are one pope and three councils against one council, and yet all five are infallible! Councils and popes may contradict each other *ad libitum*, yet they are all infallible! A Rule of Faith, replete with contradiction and vocal with discords is—marvellous fact!—a prevention of all differences, a source of all unity! The Roman number of the sacraments, viz. seven, was first taught in the Council of Trent, but was disowned and denied by Pope Gregory the Great, in his “Decretals,” 2nd part, chap. i. g. 1, sect. 84. Transubstantiation was first insisted on by the Fourth, so called, General Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215; is reiterated in the canons of Trent, and in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

This horrible dogma is disowned in the canon of the Mass, in the Sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory, and as now in use in the Roman Church. It is disowned by Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, A.D. 1115; by Alfric, archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 990; by Bertram, of Corby, A.D. 800; by Bede, an English monk, A.D. 720, in his “Commentaries on Psalm iii.,” by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 367; by Chrysostom, Augustine, Ephrem of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, &c.

Now the Church of Rome claims all these. These expositions, traditions, and canons, are a portion of her Rule of Faith. Without pronouncing a verdict on one or other side of the conflicting authorities, we have here one part of the Roman Rule of Faith against the other part, and yet both are infallibly right. Let Roman Catholics educe their senses from the priest’s pocket, and spurn the trash foisted on them in the name of Christianity.

The papal supremacy is asserted in the Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215; in the Council of Trent, and in the Creed of Pope Pius IV. The Pope’s supremacy is a vital dogma. It is disowned by the British bishops, who repudiated all fealty to Augustine, A.D. 600; by the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 438, canon viii.; by the Synod of Melevi, A.D. 416; by the First Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, canons ii. iii. vi.; by the Third Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, act xiii.; by Clement, Irenæus, Cyprian, and Cyril of Jerusalem. Thus we find two councils and one pope arrayed against various councils and numerous fathers; and yet my opponent pronounces both infallibly right, and the Rule of Faith, of which both form a part, to be infallibly perfect. This is logic!! This is unity!! No wonder, then, infidels abound in papal countries. My time prevents my giving further proofs of the contradictions which, like beasts of prey, tear and devour each other, under the exterior unanimity of the great Romish menagerie. I can only say, I should feel sorry to be obliged to swallow so many monstrosities, and, like my opponent, conceal my disgust with a quiet face and loud claims of unity. [*The reverend gentleman being here reminded by the Chairman that his time was just on the point of expiring, concluded by saying*]—Now mark, again, the greatest differences that can be proved to exist among Protestant divines do not touch our Rule of Faith, which is “THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE”—the only religion of Protestants. But the differences in the Roman Catholic Church (and I could specify thousands more, if I had time) go directly to subvert and to destroy their Rule of Faith, which consists of the written word and the un-

written word, and both propounded and expounded by the Church—a rule, two parts of which I defy him to produce, and, when he has produced that, I defy him, with all his chemistry, to distil consistency and common sense from it.

[The reverend gentleman's hour here closed, and, after a pause of a moment or two, Mr. French stood up.]

MR. FRENCH.—I rise, as usual, with the intention at least of adhering in my address as closely as possible to the laws of logic, whilst my friend, as usual, has risen with the intention of giving full play to his genius, and of indulging in his usual vein of pleasantry, tropes, and metaphors. In pursuance of the plan which I have laid down of reasoning systematically, I shall first of all touch upon his notes, and then come to more substantial matter of my own. But, in speaking of these notes, I shall a little derange the order in which I find I have placed them on my paper. I shall speak of one important note first, though it fell from the lips of my learned friend as one of the last of his observations. The learned gentleman has done me the honour to say that he cannot be at all doubtful of my integrity, sincerity, and honour, and at the same time he has given very *broad* hints that he “suspects” that integrity and veracity not a little. I am, however, very happy that you will have an opportunity, at least upon one subject, of contrasting the fairness with which my learned opponent makes *his* quotations, and those which I bring before you. It is in reference to Bishop Latimer. I visited, yesterday morning, the British Museum, in order to procure for my learned friend that extract from the sermons of Latimer which he very significantly and most ingen-

ously endeavoured to weaken by doubting its correctness—for you were all struck with its *blasphemy*: my learned opponent, I say, doubted very gravely, with a significant shake of his head, its correctness and veracity. Now I am astonished at such conduct. However, yesterday I actually forgot my notes; but, having now found them, they refer me, I perceive, to the passage; and I was again obliged to go this morning to make the extract, which took me some time. It, however, gave me an *insight* into some other parts of Cranmer's character, which I shall endeavour to lay before you, *par manière d'acquit*. But with regard to this particular passage of Latimer's, blasphemously and horribly asserting that our Lord Jesus Christ—the blessed and adorable Redeemer, whom we Catholics, at least, love with all the powers of our souls—that he went *into the regions of the damned, and suffered all the tortures of hell fire*. [Sensation.] Good God! after such a statement, what is to become of Christianity, if the bishops of the Church—men supposed to be endowed with all holiness—can indulge in blasphemous expressions with such impunity, and stand excused on the part of reverend gentlemen of the nineteenth century? It is to be found at page 85, Sermon 7th, the very sermon to which I accurately directed the attention of my friends. At page 85, here are Latimer's own words, and I hope they will rouse my learned antagonist from his seeming lethargy, or at least turn this way his studiously-averted head. [Laughter.]

“Here is much ado. These new upstarting spirits say, Christ never descended into hell, neither body nor soul. In scorn they ask, Was he there—what did he there?”

Now turn we to page 86:—"But now I will say a word; and here I protest, first of all, not arrogantly to determine and define it. I will contend with no man for it, but I offer it unto you to consider and weigh it. There be some great clerks that take my part. And I perceive not what evil can come of it, in saying that our Saviour, Christ, not only descended into hell, *but also that he suffered in hell such pains as the damned spirits did suffer there.* Surely I believe verily, for my part, that he suffered the pains of hell proportionably as it corresponded and answered to the whole sin of the world. He would not suffer only bodily in the garden and upon the cross, but also in his soul when it was from the body, which was a pain due for our sin."

But father Latimer, my friends, has not yet had his full glut of blasphemy. The celestial reformer thus proceeds:—[Laughing.]—"Some write so, and I can believe it, that he suffered in the very place, (and I cannot tell what it is—call it what you will—even in the scalding-house, in the *ugliness of the place*, in the presence of the place,) such pain as our capacity cannot attain unto; it is somewhat declared unto us, when we utter it by these *effects*, viz. by *fire*, by *gnashing of teeth*, by the *worm that gnaweth on the conscience.*"

Now, my friends, what think ye of the blessed Reformation, that engendered this blessed unheard-of monster of monsters of blasphemy, the venerable Latimer, as my learned clerk, my antagonist, calls him, in unison with all good Protestants?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—What is the page?

Mr. FRENCH.—It is to be found at page 85, Sermon 7th, and pages 85 and 86. And here, by the bye, my friends, good father Latimer

does not philosophically doubt, with "the learned clerk" (to use the good father's homely phrase)—he does not doubt, I say, with the learned clerk, my reverend antagonist, the possibility of fire reaching the immaterial spirit. You see father Latimer specifies both fire and a scalding-house. [Laughter.] But here, my friends, let us pause for a moment! Oh, horror of all horrors! Gracious God! our Saviour suffering in "the scalding-house"—suffering from the worm that dieth not, and that gnaws into the conscience, as if he had been a deep and inveterate sinner! [Renewed signs of displeasure.] And then what says the note? And here, my Catholic audience, I would entreat you, if you feel any indignation or risibility, to endeavour to suppress it. It is very difficult; it is a very hard task. Hear, then, the note of the Protestant commentator in the margin:—"Bear with father Latimer in this place." [Mingled laughter and tokens of displeasure.] Then he says, page 87, to show what sort of company he places our blessed Lord and Saviour in—he says, at page 87:—"If you have another faith than this, a whoremonger's faith, you are like to go to the scalding-house, and there you shall have two dishes—weeping and gnashing of teeth; much good do it you; you see your fare." And then, my friends, to prove that every good Protestant, bishop or layman, has a right to interpret Scripture for himself, he thus concludes—(Mark his words, and think as you hear them what *sweet unity* among Protestants their Rule of Faith, the Bible, produces!)—His words are: "I have walked this Lent in the broad field of Scripture, and used my liberty." And mark again, my friend—for my learned friend's drooping head seems to

want something to lift it up [laughter]; mark the title of the precious little gem of Protestant theology from which I have made these extracts:—“Fruitful Sermons, preached by the Right Reverend Father and constant Martyr of Jesus Christ, Mr. Hugh Latimer! London, 1584.” [Much laughter, it having been read by Mr. French in a very peculiar manner.]

Now, as my friend bestowed several elaborate sentiments of his flowery speech on the last occasion in praise of the wonderful unity which exists among Protestant sects—and of the wonderful bond of sympathy, moreover, which exists between all the Protestant sects in this room—I shall beg leave to take this opportunity of laying before you father Latimer’s opinion of one of these Protestant sects, many of whom, I believe, are in this room at this moment. Latimer’s Sermons, London, page 329. The title of the paragraph I am about to read from the celestial lecturer is, “Devilish Opinion of the Anabaptists.”—“Here are matters to confound the Anabaptists, that they only have the true word of God, and the right understanding of the same, because it beareth fruit.” “As for our opinion, they say it is naught, for it beareth no fruit, or, if it do, it is very little; which opinion is most false and erroneous.” And, in the same page, a little lower down, he says—and let the Baptists at least mark his words attentively:—“Therefore it appeareth that this opinion of the Anabaptists is most wicked and croneous, and clear against the truth of Scriptures.” Then, page 322: “The Anabaptists are but a vile set of lewd people.” Then he goes on. Now he is attacking our Catholic monks; he is putting them in association with the Anabaptists. He seems to

think there is a great similitude between the Catholic monks and the Anabaptists:—“They (the monks), forgetting this commandment of love and charity, ran away from their neighbours like beasts and wild horses, that cannot abide the company of men. So the *Anabaptists* in our time, following their example, separated themselves from the company of other men, and, therefore, God gave them *reprobum censum*, that is, a *pervert judgment*. Therefore, when thou dwellest in an evil town or parish, follow not the example of the monks or *Anabaptists*; but remember that Lot, dwelling in the midst of the Sodomites, was nevertheless preserved from the wrath of God, and such will preserve them in the midst of the wicked. But, for all that, thou must not flatter them in their evils doings and naughty livings, but rebuke their sins and wickedness, and in nowise consent unto them. Then it shall be well with thee here in this world, and in the world to come thou shalt have life everlasting; which grant both to you and me, God the Father, the Son, and God the Holy Ghost! Amen.” So that by this extract, if father Latimer, the Protestant martyr, be of any weight in the estimation of my reverend antagonist, he must not flatter the Anabaptists by calling them his good friends (as he has done this evening), and by saying, so un-Latimer like, that they are all united with him in one bond of sympathy! [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, you see what an illustrious matter Latimer thought as to the wonderful unanimity that subsists between Protestants—you see what he thought of the Anabaptists. And be cautious, orthodox Christians, such as my reverend friend, not to “flatter them,” not to soothe them on every occasion like

the present, in order to lead them to join in the cavalcade of that illustrious band at Exeter Hall, in declaiming against the Catholic, to make them forget their own private enmities with one another. But he tells you they are "a vile set—a lewd people." God forbid that I should stigmatize the Anabaptists with such sentiments as these. Far be it from me. I believe that many of them are conscientiously attached to their opinions; and I shall not tread in the steps of my learned friend, and use epithets of declamatory virulence against them in pointing out the erroneous nature of their tenets—epithets such as my learned friend has, in imitation, I presume, of good father Latimer [a laugh], so frequently, lavishly, and wantonly cast upon us.

The first note to which I shall call your attention, which I have taken down, is with regard to the version of the Bible, upon the last occasion on which we assembled together. My learned friend, in revenge for the enormities of mis-translation—the deliberate enormities of mistranslation—which I pointed out to you in the Protestant Bible, endeavoured to retaliate by pointing out similar deviations from the original text in our Bible. Now, it happens most unfortunately for him, that our Bible has the authentic stamp as to correctness, and as to exemption from deadly errors, of the whole Christian world. Editions of it have been printed at Oxford, and in every Protestant country. Who has not heard of the Vulgate for accuracy? You are not, indeed, obliged to follow it; but who can point out, from beginning to end, any systematic and deliberate perversion of the sacred text? My learned friend alluded—I had not my

notes when he observed it—to one place where I called it the sacrament of marriage—that I translated the Greek word *μυστηριον*, sacrament. I answer, that Jerome translated it sacrament and mystery also. But my learned friend says, Why not in other places translate it sacrament? He (Jerome) does: in the Epistle to the Galatians he says *sacrament* in four or five places which I have marked down. [A pause ensued, the learned gentleman stopping to look for the document first alluded to.] But I want to know [continued Mr. French] how the learned gentleman will be able to exculpate his own translators from deliberate wickedness in imposing upon the British public. I have already pointed out three or four gross perversions of this kind, from which my learned friend is not able to extenuate—with all the powers, to boot, of the most magnificently strutting rhetoric with which man was ever endowed. At the Reformation, my respected Protestant friends, when your Protestant original reformers forgot their solemn vows, and "took unto them wives"—some of them bursting open the sacred gates of convents to do it, but all of them marrying—they wanted, as a justification for this marriage in the eyes of men—in the eyes of the great God they *could* have none, for they had solemnly lifted up their hands at the altar of their God, and sworn to dedicate themselves exclusively to the service of that altar—they wanted, I say, a palliative in the eyes of men; and what did they do? They sat down deliberately, in dire diabolical conclave, to pervert the sacred passages of holy Scripture.

St. Paul says:—

"And so walk ye in the spirit (*κατ*), and do not accomplish the

desire of the flesh, for the flesh desires against the spirit :—

“But these two are opposed to one another :—

“So that ye do not the thing that ye would.”

Now, my friends, this is constantly the case in the wicked and polluted world in which we live among mankind. They forget the living God, and contaminate themselves with sin. But are they justifiable? Yes! *perfectly* justifiable in the sight of both God and man, if the Protestant Bible speaks truth. You would say,—“So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” How, then, is a man liable if he cannot? What business had they to insert the word *cannot*? Why have they put it in? It is not necessary, my friends, to understand the Greek language, in order to see the depravity of such a translation. You have only to listen and ask yourselves, Is such a word as Mr. French is going to pronounce—is it *there*? If it is not, my translators stand convicted of the deliberate perversion of sacred Writ. If it were “cannot” it would be *οὐ δύναται*, the present, or optative, or subjunctive mood. Is the word *δύναται* or *δυνήσεται* there? No, it is not. How, then, could the men dare to put it in? For the reason I give, and for no other,—Because they wished to say that men, however determined to lead a chaste and an unsullied life, and to devote themselves to God, *cannot* do it; and *that* they wanted to justify by a text in Scripture. Yes, whenever any thing touches them in a very tender point, they are sure to pervert Scripture. There is one instance of it, if my friend will travel a little down these passages, so very familiar to him. I call his attention to 1 Cor. vii. 7.

“For I wish that all men should be as myself.”

Paul says, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, 9 :—

“For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.

“I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I.

“But if they *cannot* contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.”

But he says,

“But if they *do not* contain let them marry.”

Here again the abominable translators, whom I loathe from the very bottom of my soul, because they have done it for a purpose, and not inadvertently—here again they put in the word *cannot*. But, no, it is not there. They have foisted it in, in order to give countenance to their favourite dogma,—that they had a right to marry, and that they were justified and sanctioned by Scripture in so doing—one by bursting open the gates of our sacred convents, and each of them by marrying in some way or other.

But again, I allude to a passage which my friend will not contest—it is in the Book of Maccabees, that celebrated book which we have been taught by the Church of ages to consider a book of the Bible, and in all ways canonical. I refer my friend to the 2nd Book of Maccabees, xii. 43 :—

This is the English translation of it: “And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a *sin-offering*, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection.”

44. “For, if he had not hoped that they that were slain should

have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead."

45. "And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly, it was a holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin."

Now, the English translators who translated the Bible, they were not content with denying the canonicity of what the Catholic Church declared to be canonical, but, when they sat down to translate it for us—and they did it for our *edification!* as they say; and they tell us also, that it was read in their Church for edification—finding the word "sacrifice for sin," (*θυσίαν*) in the Greek, and not liking the word sacrifice, because it is a very favourite maxim of theirs that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins"—not exactly relishing this word *θυσίαν*, they translated it "sin-offering." Mark, my friends, they must have known better: the word is *θυσία*. I never, in any poet, or any orator, or any Greek historian in the whole compass of Greek literature, heard of it; never was there so vile a mistranslation as to call that "offering" which means nothing but a *sacrifice*. I have taken the trouble to count the number of times in which the word *θυσία* occurs in the Greek, in the Old and New Testaments, and I find it occurs 224 times. Two hundred and twenty-three times have the Protestant translators translated it *sacrifice*; in this one solitary place, to their eternal shame and ignominy, they have translated the word *θυσία* *offering*.

Mr. CUMMING—[hastily.]—*Sin*. [We presume the reverend gentleman meant *sin-offering*.]

Mr. FRENCH—[in reply.]—*περι*

ἀμαρτίας θυσίαν means "*sacrifice concerning sin*."

Rev. J. CUMMING.—*θυσίαν* stands alone by itself.

Mr. FRENCH.—Do you mean *sin*, or do you mean that your version has it *SIN-offering*?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Yes!—[We believe the reverend gentleman referred to the latter of the two foregoing questions.]

Mr. FRENCH—[citing the passage.]—*περι ἀμαρτίας θυσίαν*—that is, "*sacrifice concerning sin*." You have been honest enough to give the word *sin*, but then what is *offering*? Where is the word *sacrifice*—where is it, my friend?—[to Mr. Cumming]. Oh, my Protestant friends! if you could know what sacrilege there is in all this, what mockery there is of all that is sacred in Scripture! For what is more awful than to sit down and *vitate* the pure fountain of truth?—to sit down, when you have it in your power to translate correctly, and to do it incorrectly? And what will be done by my learned friend when he rises up? Some quibbling sophistry, I doubt not—some *special pleading*—about its probable meaning is sin offering, and then referring to other places in sacred Scripture. But, my friends, they stand convicted—the Protestant translators of the English Bible stand convicted to all eternity; and if the learned gentleman were to bring all the scholars of Oxford or Cambridge, and place them so that they were all ranged in one thick phalanx around me, I should utterly confound them all, and make them hang down their heads in shame. There is no possibility of extricating them from this. What I now say may go forward to them. They may write tome upon tome, and volume upon volume, and I will laugh them all to scorn. The

learned gentleman says we approximate to his version. I know not what the learned gentleman means! Do we take any deadly, soul-ruining errors from his, and engraft them into our sacred Bible? No, we would rather die, to a man, than do it. But mark, my friends, it is only within these thirty or forty years past that our priests were permitted to learn their native language. Of course, when they came over to you, or when they translated at Rheims or Douay, unacquainted with their native language, they were ready to avail themselves of more elegant English, just as I would if at this moment I were to take the Greek Bible; and I am sure I could give a better translation, and, in many respects, eclipse the English translation; but I should find various elegant terms of phraseology in the English Bible worthy of preservation. I told my learned friend that, as Dr. Doyle said, "it was a noble version," and in all respects worthy of the title I assigned it of "*la belle infidèle*—the beautiful traitress," a name originally given by a celebrated French writer to an imperfect version of *Thucydides*. That is the only claim it has to the panegyric of Dr. Doyle. The English of it is beautiful, I must say;—and how should the Douay people, who were banished by the Julians, the apostates of the day, and forbidden to learn their native language—how should they do otherwise, but, when they found it disfigured by many gallicisms—how, I say, should they do otherwise than be desirous of chastening it with genuine English? And very properly so. But how does my learned friend endeavour to extricate himself from the dilemma into which he is plunged, and in which he flounders about and falls into more unfathomable

depths than ever? I direct your attention, my friends, in reference to the Sabbath, to Leviticus xiii.

Now, then, I want to know how Protestants dared, without listening to the voice of tradition in the Catholic Church, how they *dared* to alter the Sabbath? There is another part in the Bible, my friends, in which curses are heaped on the head of those who should dare to violate the keeping of the Sabbath. What does my learned friend say by way of excuse for thus changing the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday? He says he "spurns tradition." At one time he goes to it and at another spurns it. Last evening he did not dare to border on tradition; this evening he is inclined to go to tradition for this, and my learned friend then tells me that primitive Christianity observed it so. What, I ask, has he to do with primitive Christianity, or what has primitive Christianity to do with him?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—From the Bible!

Mr. FRENCH—[with emphasis.] *From the Bible!* The Bible does not say a single word about it—not a word. I called on my learned friend to prove to me the other day from his Bible, which he takes as his Rule of Faith, to prove to me the personality of the Holy Ghost. This evening he imagines that the little sophistry he has used will enable him to persuade the Protestant part of his audience that he has completely proved it. Now, I must inform my learned friend upon this subject, that it was denied even by the fathers of the Church; that is, denied to be clearly proved by the Bible. And although my learned friend has quoted a note from the Douay Bible, where it says it can be proved, I deny it *in toto*, and differ entirely from the learned gentleman; and I certainly

am not to be bound by his *ipse dixit*. But even there the learned commentator does not mean to say it is proved satisfactorily to every Catholic without the accordant voice of tradition. He knew better. He knew that we look for tradition for all these things. St. Austin says—and I have chapter and verse for what I say—the Benedictine edition, tome ii. ed. 1670, p. 46. My friend certainly is more dexterous than St. Austin. He can prove any thing, no matter whatever the difficulty is in Scripture, satisfactorily to his own mind. A single touch of his magic tongue dissolves the hardest truths and abstrusest problems. [Laughter.] St. Austin thought the authority of the Church necessary, in order to prove the equality of the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The text by which my friend proves the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, is the following one, John xiv. 16:—“And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.” 17. “*Even the Spirit of Truth.*”

Now, mark the word *Comforter*. He calls it the *Paraclete*, although he knows it is—Comforter in his own:—

GEORGE FINCH, Esq.—Protestant chairman,—He (Mr. Cumming) read it out of *your* Bible—[to Mr. French.]

MR. FRENCH.—Why not read out of *your own*?

REV. J. CUMMING.—I will do it [opening the Bible.]

MR. FRENCH.—[playfully.]—You will, but I am doing it for you.—[A laugh.]

Now, my friends, the word *Comforter*. How am I to understand when the word—such an indefinite word as “*Comforter*”—is used,

that it is the same as *Paraclete*? The Unitarian, if asked his opinion, will say, “I do not see the personation of the Spirit of Truth, of the Holy Ghost, there;” nor do you; and I tell you candidly that, as a Catholic, if I had no better authority, I would not believe it. I therefore require something stronger than that. That text will not satisfy me that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. The Unitarian says, he must have been authorized by the Father, and sent; but that does not prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. But what the Douay Bible means to inculcate is, that this text is analogous to the voice of tradition, and must satisfy the Catholic. I say so too, and all the Catholics in this room; but a mere isolated text would never satisfy the Catholic without the *voice* of the Church. Then my friend says, “My Father is greater than I;” and immediately, in his own plenipotentialism, crushes the Unitarian, and the Unitarian says it crushes the Trinitarian. Well, the Bible is the Rule of Faith; and how comes it to pass this difference among persons equally solicitous to come at the truth? God forbid that I should side with any man, either in this room or elsewhere, who should condemn the Unitarians as hypocrites, or as not being Christians, at least in the Protestant acceptance of the word “*Christian*.” The Bible being the Rule of Faith, they are as much Christians as the Calvinists are. They chalk out a line of Christianity for themselves; they have no Church to tell them what is truth, and they see many expressions which, taken in the abstract, go to tell them that Christ is inferior to the Father. But my friend singles out this one as the most over-

powering text to silence the voice of the Unitarian. I do not. I have a little treatise against the Unitarians, which has operated a number of conversions, I am happy to tell you; and I think I have collected different texts in the Bible in such a manner as to strike out some light upon this subject; at least I laid them down so satisfactorily and so solidly, as to dispose more than one Unitarian to come over to the Catholic religion; for, in fact, they all told me, that the moment they ceased to be Unitarians, they would come to the ROCK OF AGES. But "my Father is greater than I"—my friend says there is the proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ. How so? The Unitarian calls him the adopted Son of God. Very well; that, he says, is our analogy between celestial things and terrestrial; and I contend that that text is not at all satisfactory, taken by itself, to disprove the tenets of the Unitarian at all. My learned friend will accuse me, I know, here, of leaning towards infidelity. All I can say is, my conscience acquits me of that; but, if he meant to reproach me to exasperation, he would accuse me of leaning towards *Calvinism*. Among all the various desultory observations of my learned friend is one, I find, concerning marriage; and he observes, most infallibly, that the Catholic Church is the "Lady of Babylon"—a reproach which he has been in the habit for many years past of lavishing upon us—and, as one proof of it, he appeals to the forbidding of marriage. Now, mark, gentlemen: if there is anything in the prophecies of Scripture, which I should point out by the finger, to bring home against Protestants, it is this very prohibition of marriage. The Catholic Church never did nor could

forbid it. If it did, that moment I would tell the Catholic Church it was a false one. The Catholic Church will not admit any one to its priesthood who is married; but it does say to a man before he enters the priesthood, "Thou shalt not marry." But we have seen the accomplishment of this in our day, and we shall see the legislature, if I mistake not, take further steps in it. We have seen a treatise lately from the pen of parson Malthus, and other parsons have taken up the pen, calling on the legislature to limit the right of unbounded marriage; and it remains for Protestants to accomplish the awful prediction. We advise every one who lives in this wicked world not to devote himself to the altar if he marry. It is much better; and many are the males and females who devote themselves to the single and uninterrupted service of their God, and to a life of purity and holiness in our sacred convents; and Protestants can testify to the same. You have had one *here* for centuries [*we understand there is a very ancient convent in some secluded part of the town,*] and what tongue would dare to slander their holiness and purity? We do not discountenance marriage, but we glory in our priesthood and our bishops; such monuments of sanctity strike every one with awe as they meet them along the streets. They are the true priests indeed. They abstain. The learned gentleman doubts whether I am in orders or not. No; I am not worthy—I am a married man; but if I were a priest of the living God, I should think myself one of the most contaminated of mortals on the face of the earth, if I could be so forgetful of my sacred vows as to act as your "sainted!" reformers did—your Luther and Calvin—who, after

having called God to witness they would abstain from marriage all the days of their life, do it in open opposition to those vows, and then pretend, with hypocritical sanctity, to be reformers. Oh, gentlemen, it makes one's blood boil in one's veins!—and then, not content with marrying, contrary to that one solemn engagement not to do it, to sit down with infernal spirit, and in the utmost deliberation, call on that sacred book to speak in conformity to their abominable tenets. The learned gentleman upbraided us for mistranslating the Bible, where it says, "The priest's lips *shall* keep knowledge;" and where I proved that they (the Protestant translators) had no right to translate it *should*, and that it was a wicked perversion, there my learned friend calls away your attention from the word. I asked my friend, the other evening, if he would translate "Thou *shalt* not commit adultery," Thou *shouldst* not commit adultery?—and he seemed to shudder at it; and I repeat, here is no room at all for the application of the passage but by its referring to the admonition and authority of the priests.

Luther, "in the heat of controversy," as the learned gentleman contends, called James the Apostle's Epistle "a *chaffy* epistle;" and are we, in an assembly of Christians, to be told by the Reverend Mr. Cumming that he can extenuate the guiltiness of a reformer, a prime reformer, raised up, as he says, by God "to effect great purposes," because, forsooth, when he blasphemes a sacred part of the Bible, he blasphemes, poor man, *in the heat of controversy*. Is it possible that my friend can smile upon him, and pardon him, and pass an act of absolution on him immediately in the plenitude of his power? And

why? Because "he said it in *the heat* of controversy!" Did you ever hear such a word as that (*i.e.* chaffy) escape from my lips concerning the inspired volume, though I thunder loudly against the mistranslations of their English Bible? Do I raise a sacrilegious voice against the well, accurately, and faithfully translated Bible? No, gentlemen, it is all alike inspired; and if I were once capable of saying that one part was inferior in sanctity to another, that moment I should cease to be a member of the Catholic Church.

My learned friend next called my attention to several opinions of Jerome and others concerning certain books. Why, I can tell my friend that, until about the seventh century, there were several doubts in the Church of God about the Epistle to the Hebrews, though the Council of Carthage, which was a general council, enumerated it among the inspired books, and it was also enumerated in the Council of Carthage. But when once a council has settled a book, as the Council of Trent had done in a solemn manner, making the books correspond accurately, at that moment all dissentient voices lie hushed, whether it be Cardinal Bellarmine, or Jerome, or Cajetan:—he who denies the Book of Maccabees, or Judith, or any other book, to be considered part of the Bible, he belongs to *you*; he is no longer a Catholic. It is impossible to remain in the Catholic Church, and call in question any one part of the sacred volume which has been once decided by a Council—by an ecumenical council.

My friend says there is no diversity as to essentials among Reformers. Before I have done with you this evening I will give you broad stamps of this their diversity. He says, Mr. French has dwelt copiously upon this, with great emphasis and

importance; but, after all, it is "a mare's nest." [Laughter.] I really do not know what he means by "a mare's nest," but this I know—if there be such a thing as a mare's nest, and if in that nest I should chance to find one generous high-born colt, with several long-eared asses peeping out of that said nest, I think I could say, without self-flattery, that I should be able to discriminate at first glance the genuine from the bastard, the noble-born from the ignoble and the degenerate offspring. [Loud laughter.] Gentlemen, without the necessity of any explication on my part, I perceive you understand my allusion. But the learned gentleman says they do not differ in fundamentals. Gracious heaven! how often has that been repeated by my learned friend, and with how little appearance of truth and accuracy! No *fundamental* differences between Protestants in this room! Can a man, standing in the presence of his God, assert that with any solemnity? My learned friend has another full hour to indulge his vein of oratory. Let my learned friend, therefore, for one evening, allow his tongue to adhere, if possible, to the sacred line of truth. Let him recant or retract his expressions, for it is impossible that he can mean what he endeavours to impress upon you, namely, that the various Protestants in this room—the Anabaptists, the Calvinists, the Lutherans, the Quakers, the Dissenters—do not differ in fundamentals. If my learned friend maintains seriously that they do not, I must drop the question at once, because I cannot give him a direct denial. But I leave my Catholic friends to draw their inference from it, knowing as they well do, that it is in fundamentals that they (different sects) differ, and not in trifling and insig-

nificant circumstances. If it were so, they would be a formidable body, and they then would not correspond to that ancient saying in the Bible, to which they so literally approximate—"a house *divided* among themselves." [The learned gentleman here paused to ascertain how much of the hour yet remained.] I find I have only five minutes more. I am loth to begin a new subject. However, I shall avail myself of most of the time that still remains to me, in order to give my learned opponent some little solid matter to go upon this evening. I wish first to ask my learned opponent to prove a little more satisfactorily than he has hitherto done, the accuracy of that Rule of Faith which he has thrown down so pompously on the table. I wish him to prove that God the Father is not begotten—from the Bible. Secondly, that God the Son is not made nor created, but begotten by the Father only. And thirdly, that the Holy Ghost is neither made nor begotten, but proceedeth from the Father and the Son. All this I wish to have proved in a straightforward practical manner, in a manner accessible to the understanding of every one in this room; I wish him to prove his Rule of Faith, which he has thrown down with such an air of ineffable defiance on the table; that he who will be saved must believe these articles just specified—"for these are the articles of the Catholic faith, which unless a man hold in his integrity without doubt, he will be lost to all eternity." I wish him, moreover, to prove by *direct* texts the baptism of infants; for, mark, my friends, this concerns *one-third part of the human race*, and, therefore, I am anxious to see with what face my friend will rise in a moment. [A laugh.] I know very well, and we believe that he can

speak on any thing ; but with what face will he be able to show that you differ in trifles and not in fundamentals, when there are sects in this room who maintain that the water in baptism is not necessary, and others, that without water we are lost to all eternity ? And when he attempts to prove the necessary baptism of infants, my friend must give something more solid than he has done—something more solid than such a text as “he was baptized with all his household.” Suppose the text said, such and such persons were *confirmed* with all their household, would it follow that the babies were confirmed who were just born ? Suppose it said, “They were all confirmed reading their Bibles.” Were the little babies in the cradle reading their Bibles ? [A laugh.] Was there any instance before that verse appeared in the Bible, of infants being baptized ? If there were, my friend would have a just ground for saying, that when Paul and his household was baptized, that the infants were baptized also. I beg my friend to give a direct answer to all this, and, most important of all, to prove to me the *baptism of infants* ; and then, my friend will condescend to reconcile the palpable discordancies, viz. that you Protestants in this room differ but in lesser circumstances, and to make out to us Catholics how it is a trifle that one-third of the human race should go to their doom without water poured on their heads. Now, if my learned friend will condescend to bestow a few of his eloquent sentences on that subject, I shall be extremely obliged to him this evening.

Gentlemen, my time is up. I have only time to say, Protestants being all unanimous upon primary fundamental proofs, let him prove their unanimity.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It must have been apparent to the mind of every attentive and unbiassed auditor, that my learned antagonist had one simple object in view, and that to that object he has most pertinaciously adhered throughout. Conscious that he could not meet the plain and simple positions which I have made good, he has tried to divert your attention from the real question at issue, and to turn it to a thousand and one particulars about every and any subject that has entered into his mind. I do not intend this evening to pursue and expose him as usual in his flight. If I did so I should gratify him, as he courts any and every discussion save the discussion and exposure of the Papacy. I will, *en passant*, touch the *summa fastigia rerum*—one or two of the leading points, and then proceed to show the boasted unity of his own Church, and thereby to demonstrate how ridiculous are his vauntings of the safety and harmonizing powers of his Rule of Faith.

With respect to baptism. I already stated that I did not feel it necessary to enter into a discussion of the question, simply because he and I, whatever any one in this assembly thinks, are agreed that infant baptism is demonstrable from the Bible. I refer to his own version of the Bible, and the appendix at its close, under the heading, “Baptism of Infants,” and in that appendix he will find it declared that two texts alone prove the scriptural nature and origin of infant baptism ; and, therefore, unless he rejects Dr. Murray and the Douay Bible, we are perfectly agreed upon the point, that infant baptism can be proved from Scripture, and need not spend time in discussing points of agreement while there are so many points of vital diversity.

Mr. FRENCH.—Of course.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It is not necessary, therefore, to convince you that it can be proved from Scripture. We are agreed on that point.

Mr. FRENCH.—Read the place.

Rev. J. CUMMING—[complying]. “For the baptism of infants, see St. Luke xviii. 16, compared with St. John iii. 5.”

Now, I am not called at present to pronounce a verdict on the point. All that I contend for is, that his Church, as she or her representative speaks in the notes to his Bible, declares that infant baptism is pointed out by these two texts alone. Now, right or wrong, we are agreed on that point. We can prove it without tradition,—Dr. Murray, Romish Archbishop of Dublin, being judge. It would, therefore, be a work of supererogation to convince an antagonist that infant baptism could be proved from the word of God, because he is already satisfactorily convinced. But do not entertain the idea for a moment, that I hold it a fundamental difference, whether one is baptized at eight months or eighteen years. This is not a vast difference, in my mind. This is a mere question of chronology; it is not a vital and essential difference in theology. I do not hold the *opus operatum* of Rome. If I held that, then I would say the Baptists would be seriously wrong. Millions are baptized with water, ay, and in my antagonist's way, with the priest's spittle too, and yet not baptized with the Holy Ghost. I agree with the Anglican Article, that the sacraments are “generally necessary to salvation.” I here leave the question, knowing that no baptized Christian in this assembly will hold that the chronology of baptism is a vital and essential difference.

My opponent had the audacity

again to quote from Latimer respecting the descent of Christ into hell. I showed you that Latimer, two or three sentences below, in the same sermon, stated that this was a notion he thought not improbable, but which he neither held nor insisted on—in other words, Latimer wished to show that the sufferings which Christ endured when he drank the cup of wrath were as great as if he had descended into hell; and when he uses language that he did so, he puts it as perfect hypothesis, which you may reject or receive as you please. But after you have heard this string of denunciations from my antagonist, used to cover his garbling of Latimer, what will be your surprise to find that *the doctors of his own Church hold the idea of Latimer, without the qualification or liberty which Latimer appends to it?* In order to show this, I quote from Bellarmine, *de Christo*, lib. iv. c. 16. pp. 396, 397, &c. :—

“St. Thomas, pp. 3, 9, 52, art. ii. teaches that Christ, by his real presence, descended but to *limbus patrum*, and in effect only to the other places of hell. Secondly, St. Thomas seems to say that it was some punishment to Christ to be in hell, according to his soul. CAJETAN saith that the sorrows of Christ's death continued on him till his resurrection, in regard of three penalties, whereof the second is, that *THE SOUL REMAINED IN HELL*, a place not convenient for it. But Bonaventure saith that Christ's *SOUL*, *WHILE IT WAS IN HELL*, was in the place of punishment indeed, but without punishment; which seems to me more agreeable to the fathers.”

Such is an extract from Bellarmine. In the same place that celebrated cardinal attacks Durandus, who, he says, agrees with Calvin in

thinking that Christ's soul did not go into hell.

MR. FRENCH.—Not hell, but limbo.

REV. J. CUMMING—[in surprise]. Limbo!

MR. FRENCH.—All three.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I must refer to it again.

[Here the reverend gentleman read the first part of the extract from Bellarmine a second time.]

MR. FRENCH.—No, that is part.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Very well; I will go on. "CAJETAN saith that the sorrows of Christ's death continued on him till his resurrection, whereof the second is, that his *soul remained in hell.*"

MR. FRENCH.—No, no, no.

REV. J. CUMMING.—Well, then, I leave this, as I can easily afford it, and go on. St. Bonaventure says, "that Christ's soul, WHILE IT WAS IN HELL."

My opponent has merely to transfer the anathemas he hurled at Lattimer, which I have shown to be undeserved, and henceforth hurl them at Cardinal Cajetan, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventure, for which last idolater there is a collect in Mr. French's Missal for the proper day. My opponent excels all I ever encountered in laying traps and gins for himself.

The next quotation of my learned friend was from Jewel, in which the bishop did not compliment those whom he names as the Anabaptists of his day. Now, I ask my Protestant audience, whether the Baptists of the present day are the same body as the Baptists of Jewel's day? They differ as much as *Dominus Deus* does from my learned antagonist, Mr. French. [Laughter.] The Anabaptists were a turbulent body, some centuries ago, without, perhaps, one feature in common with the Baptists of this day. The

Baptists of the present day are a body of Christians, among whom were a Hall and a Carey, differing about the time when the sacrament of Baptism is to be administered; and, therefore, I really think that this reference to the Anabaptists is another of the very fallible failures into which my learned antagonist has plunged himself. But, as regards Jewel—even taking his words in the strongest sense in which he speaks—when he speaks disrespectfully of another Christian, they are milk and water to Romish recriminations. Suppose I show you how the doctors of his (Mr. French's) Church speak one of another; for instance, a pope of a council, or a council of a pope. The Council of Pisa, A.D. 1409, thus describes the two rival popes of that century:—

"The aforesaid Angelo Corrario and Peter de Luna, the competitors for the Popedom, have been and are, notorious schismatics, obstinate and notorious heretics, entangled in the enormous and infamous crimes of perjury and violation of promise."

A Rhemish Council, A.D. 1131, according to Baronius, "excommunicated Pope Peter as an intruder, and consigned him to the roaring lion." These are rich compliments to the Pope, therefore.

Again—"The holy Council of Basil pronounces, decrees, and declares Pope Eugenius IV. to be notoriously contumacious, a simoniac, a perjured man, an OBSTINATE HERETIC."—*Labbeus*, vol. xiii. p. 619. [Laughter.]

Observe, here is a council of the Roman Catholic Church speaking in this very courteous and beautiful language of one, whom a portion of that Church calls infallible. This is the unity—the *concordia discors* of Rome. Then, to show you that

these gentlemen, the popes, were not accustomed to retaliation—that the *lex talionis* was known among them [laughter]—we read of the way in which they retaliate as follows:—

“Eugenius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, &c.

“The evil spirits of the whole world seem to have collected in that *den of robbers* at Basil: we declare and decree that each of the above were and are schismatics and heretics.”

Observe, the Council of Basil, one part of my opponent’s Rule of Faith, does not hesitate to call the Pope, who is another part, a notorious heretic and breaker of the peace; and the Pope returns the compliment, and does not scruple to denounce the Council of Basil as “a den of robbers.” “When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war.” [Loud laughter.] Therefore, when my learned antagonist brings forward Jewel, speaking of a sect called the Anabaptists, he is a long way outside of our Rule of Faith; but we are breaking the very heart and body of his when we show popes and councils on such terms. You observe pope arrayed against council, and council against pope, and yet the Rule of Faith and the *unity* of the Church of Rome are its pleas for your instant conversion to its principles and creed.

Again, driven off at every point, he brought forward again what he calls our Bible mistranslation. I call upon this audience to remember and witness that I replied to his arguments upon our version of the Bible at length. He is anxious for me to waste the whole of the hour assigned me in going over the same ground which I have already satisfactorily dispatched, and in which I showed you that what he called

dering of the original tongue, and that in that passage, where your translators have “ye do not the things that ye would,” I said, your translators have given a rendering which makes perfect nonsense of it. When you say, “ye do not the things that ye would,” does it not mean to imply that ye cannot do them? The Romish version is in this instance literal—“Ye do not do the things which ye would;” but our version gives the obvious sense, “ye cannot,” and expressly asserts the meaning of the Holy Spirit.

Now, I revert to the word *μυστήριον*. I call your attention to this. He says it has rightly been rendered *sacrament* in the Roman Catholic version. I hold in my hand [displaying a paper] twenty-six passages collected from the Douay Bible. In only one place is *μυστήριον* rendered *sacrament*, that is, where marriage, one of the seven Papal sacraments, is spoken of; and in the twenty-five others it is rendered *mystery*. Why this inconsistency?

Again, he complained that the Protestant clerical reformers were married. They did quite right. Peter had a wife, for the Scripture speaks of “Peter’s wife’s mother.” And again, “A bishop must be the husband of one wife;” and therefore, to stand up and maintain that clergymen must not marry, may be one of the hallucinations of tradition, but it is not one of the rescripts of the word of God. On the text, “Peter’s wife’s mother,” perhaps my friend has some *unwritten* lore. Did Peter get the marriage bill repealed? Did he get a divorce against his wife, and turn her off the moment he became Pope? [Laughter.]

Again, I referred you to one of his own Popes, Gregory the

Great, who rejects the Book of Maccabees——

Mr. FRENCH.—No, no!

Rev. J. CUMMING—[in reply].—I quoted the proof on a former occasion. Mr. French cannot deny it. I will give the passage again in the original, as well as translated. It is fatal to the Papacy:—

“De quâ re non inordinate facimus si ex libris, licet non canonicis, sed tamen ad ædificationem plebis editis testimonium proferamus. Eleazar namquam in procelso elephante, feriens stravit, sed sub ipso occubuit.”—*Greg. Mar. lib. xix. c. 39, B. Job. Bened. Edit. Parisiis, 1705.*

Thus Pope Gregory asserts that the book from which he takes the instance of Eleazar is not canonical. Deny it if you dare. Be not deceived, my Roman Catholic hearers; Pope Gregory the Great calls that book human, which your present Pope, Gregory XVI., calls inspired.

Then my learned friend seems to have found another striking illustration of our mistranslations, and he says we have rendered the Greek word “an offering for sin,” which they have rendered “a sacrificing for sin.” Now, what is the difference? Sin-offering, and sacrificing for sin, are the same thing; and therefore, this is any thing but a strong reason for upbraiding our translators in the unmeasured terms in which my antagonist was pleased to indulge. My opponent is so utterly at a loss for objections, that he tries to make distinctions without differences.

Again, he denies that the Rheimists, when they came to this country, took our version and incorporated it partly with their own. He says, they never took the *errors*, they only took the *beauties*. Now, I am glad to hear him acknowledge at last, that beauties do exist in our

version, notwithstanding his denunciations of it. I feel yet more glad that you have been improving your own version by approximating it to ours more and more.

In the next place, he says, he could give a better version of the vulgate Latin than the English version of Dr. Murray, which lies on the table, and is in the hands of Roman Catholics.

Mr. FRENCH.—No, no: of the Greek New Testament.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Oh, very well: of the Greek New Testament—a better version than Archbishop Murray's. Then the question I next ask is, How is it that Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, has so long overlooked my opponent's distinguished merits? Why has he sent out this, when he knows that there is a distinguished barrister in the Roman Catholic Church, named Daniel French, who is able for no great reward to supply a better translation? Here we have the bishops of the Irish Church pronouncing this version to be the best.

Mr. FRENCH.—Yes.

Rev. J. CUMMING—[in continuation].—And here is Mr. French saying it is not; and thus, when doctors differ, it remains for others abler than myself to reconcile them.

Again, he disputes the Lord's day to be the primitive day. I went to the word of God, and I adduced successive passages which distinctly declare, that the first day of the week is the day now called the Lord's day, upon which the primitive Christians met together for the celebration of Divine service; and I said, that such a precedent is sufficient, especially after Cardinal Bellarmine's admission, in which I coincide, that there are conditions in the Epistle to the Galatians, which absolve us from the observance of the Jewish Sabbath.

His next remark was, his odd dissatisfaction with me, for daring to prove that the fifteenth of John, twenty-sixth verse, demonstrates the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. He blames me for seeing it in that text. He ought to blame his own Church also for seeing the same thing in that text. He ought to excommunicate Dr. Murray and the Rhemish translators, for they see as I see also. Let me refresh my opponent's memory. *Note in the Douay Bible on St. John xv. 26* : — "This proves, against the modern Greeks, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, as well as from the Father, otherwise he could not be sent by the Son."

This is the opinion of every body save my opponent, who, in this matter, stands pre-eminently alone. There is not a word, you see, about the aid of tradition; and therefore, if I was so blind as to say the text proves what my opponent required, or, rather, if my eyes were so perverted as to see proof in the text, surely I may be excused when the commentators of his own Bible have seen the same thing long before I was born. [Laughter.]

My opponent seemed to deny that Paraclete means the Holy Spirit. Now, if I was wrong in saying Paraclete means the Holy Spirit when I used it, it follows that his commentators must be wrong also, for they say the same. They well knew, what nobody in his senses denies, that the Paraclete means the Holy Spirit; but Mr. French, painfully ignorant of his own Bible, turns round upon me for saying that Paraclete means the Holy Spirit. Here again, Mr. French is against Dr. Murray, and against the commentators on his own Bible; and yet there is unity in the Church of Rome! Do not fail to note, that every one of these remarks is loosen-

ing his Rule of Faith, until, I believe, we shall have him standing with the whole fabric in ruins around him, and only the indestructible book, the word of the living God, preserved as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Again, he says, I only quoted one text to prove the Deity of Christ to disprove Arianism. I believe I quoted many texts; but, you observe, in order to give a full series of lectures upon this controversy, it would take five or six weeks, and I cannot be dragged into it merely to satisfy my learned antagonist.

My opponent asks, How are we sure that we have the Bible pure, as the overwhelming majority of the bishops of the fourth century were Arians? I reply, We have nearly the whole Bible quoted in books before the Arian heresy: we received copies of it they did not and could not touch; and only certain parts of it which were subjects of dispute could be tampered with. The Bible is the book of God, and, Romanists themselves being judges, it is pure now as at the first. The shield of Heaven has been stretched over it. If the great majority of the western bishops became Arians, then it turns out that the Rule of Faith of the Roman Church did not prevent the bishops from falling into heresy. Is my opponent aware that he is *breaking up* his own Rule of Faith? so that every position which he makes causes him to tremble on the verge of Roman Catholic suicide. I was going to use a familiar illustration. Perhaps it is too familiar; but as Mr. French condescends, I may be allowed. You have seen a pig when it is forced to swim—some Irishmen in this assembly know its habits [laughter]: when this native of the Emerald Isle attempts to swim, its two foremost legs are sure to cut his own throat

before it can reach the banks : and my friend, in his plunging to compare higher things with lower, in looking after support and struggling towards victory, deliberately cuts his own throat. [Laughter.]

The next remark of my antagonist was, that if one cease to be a Socinian, he must be a Roman Catholic ; that is, if I leave Hammersmith, *I must necessarily* go to Hounslow. [Laughter.] His next remark was of the unintelligible. I can only accuse him of marvellous ignorance of Scripture, in so speaking of the texts I quoted.

He next stated that marriage was not prohibited to the priests of the Church of Rome, and yet they are not allowed to marry. Now, this curious distinction is so splendid, that I need not answer it. It shines by its own light. [Laughter.] He then quoted Malthus as having proposed some restrictions on marriage. Malthus, I assure you, is not my Pope. If Malthus were an apostle, I would pause ; but this poor man, being against marriage, was as likely a monk as anything else. *Query*.—Does the celibacy of the Roman clergy really promote the desiderata of Malthus ?—He thenceforth complained that I called Rome “the lady of Babylon.” Now, his own Church has frequently asserted before, that St. Peter calls Rome Babylon. Blame your Church, and not me. For instance, we read in St. Peter’s epistle, “The Church which is at Babylon saluteth you.”

Mr. French. — [Hurriedly.] — Where ?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[In continuation.]—1 Pet. v. 13 ; and I find in the Roman Catholic Bible this appropriate note : “FIGURATIVELY ROME.” [Laughter.] I said the Church of Rome was Babylon, and the notes in his own Bible declare the same thing. Now, I request

all discerning Protestants to read Apocalypse, chap. xviii., for a picture of Rome or Babylon ; and rich and rare for my opponent’s Church are all the resulting consequences of such an admission.

His next remark was as to Malachi, that we have corrupted the translation of *should*, and that their translation is “shall ;” and that they are right here and never anywhere wrong. The following text, which, as usual, my opponent leaves out, illustrates the meaning of the one he reads before it, where it says, “But ye (*the priests*) have gone out of the way, and caused the people of God to err.”—The next thing was that of applauding the conduct of Luther in rejecting the Epistle of James. I never did so. If Luther rejected it in the heat of controversy, I can palliate, but not excuse. His enemies were many, and bitter, and bloodthirsty ; but he is not to be praised for it—by no means—Luther is to be blamed for it. But Luther is not a part of my Rule of Faith. This settles the force of the reference. Some of his own Church, as I will show, also agree with Luther. But though Mr. French has promised to bring forward some hundred writers who have asserted a hundred whims, they have nothing to do with our Rule of Faith ; they are neither part nor parcel of it. Mr. French may, with equal effect, play on the violin, or dance a Scotch reel or a hornpipe, as make such irrelevant quotations. [Loud laughter.] I repeat, his quoting the differences of Protestants does no more touch our Rule of Faith, than quoting the differences of poets and painters. It remains untouched and unscathed, though every individual before me were to hold more ridiculous whims than my opponent. But remember, that, when I touch

the expositions of his councils and the fathers of his Church, I am striking at the very foundation of the rule: I am tearing his Rule of Faith into shreds; I am breaking his rule to pieces at every blow, by showing the sentiments of the fathers connected with it. Now hear. I quote St. Thomas on the subject of his kind and degree of worship given to images. Thomas Aquinas, as quoted by Bellarmine, says, part iii. 9, 25, art. 3; "The same honour is due to the image as to the thing expressed by it;" and, therefore, Christ's image is to be worshipped with the worship of *latria*—St. Mary's with *hyper-doulia*—the saints with *doulia*.

Observe, the Roman Catholic Church is ever asserting that she gives only the subordinate worship of *δουλεία* to images; but here we find the "seraphic" doctor Aquinas referred to in terms the most eulogistic by my learned antagonist, declaring that the supreme worship of *latria* is to be given to the cross of Christ or to the images of Christ. Now, then, if Mr. French says that *doulia* only is to be given to the cross and images of Christ, and Thomas says the very reverse, you have again a marvellous proof of the unanimity that reigns in the bosom of the Church of Rome. I here hold another document in my hand, the truths of which Mr. French, I know, will disclaim; and, if he does, he will just do what I wish him to do, for he will again show the never-to-be-broken unanimity of the Roman Church. [Laughter.] I quote from Townsend's "Accusations of History," in reply to Butler:—

"The duty of deposing a king, upon whom sentence of deposition has been passed by the Pope, implied also the necessity of killing him, if the decree of the Pope

could not otherwise be accomplished."

Bishop Taylor proves that the Jesuits taught that, when the Pope has passed sentence, it is lawful for a private man to kill a king. "That I say true," adds Taylor, "I appeal to *Gregory de Valentia*, tom. iii. dis. 5, 8, 9; *Tolet*, In suum, lib. v. 6; *Bellarmino*, Apolog. ad R. Angl. c. 13; *Suarez*, Defens. Fidei, lib. vii. 4; *Salmeron*, in 13 cap. ad Rom. disp. 5; *Seranus*, *Molina*, *Emmanuel*, *St. Thomas Aquinas*, and above a dozen others of the most celebrated doctors of the Roman Church—all of whom teach the lawfulness of killing kings after public sentence, and yet deny that they commit regicide in so doing."

Now observe, my antagonist stands by Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic bishop of Dublin, and denies the statement that it is lawful to kill a king deposed by the Pope; while I quote all these distinguished doctors—Tolet, Aquinas, and many others—to show the very opposite, and that these were believed, preached, and acted out by the most distinguished doctors of many a sanguinary age of the Roman Catholic Church. I say, this great catalogue of learned doctors, the champions and children of the papacy, maintain that it is right and lawful to kill a king who has been deposed by the Pope, and that, in so doing, you are not guilty of regicide. Mr. French and the present bishops of his Church publicly deny and reprobate the dogma; their predecessors hold it and glory in it. So that you have here another proof of the unanimity existing in the Church of Rome, and of the efficacy of her recipe for avoiding the mangled and mutilated fragments fathered by my opponent illegitimately on Calvin and Luther, and others.—He has next quoted

at second hand, and with stereotype fidelity in garbling, from Bossuet, whom he recommends to me. I return him the compliment, by recommending him to read "EDGAR'S VARIATIONS OF POPERY," and he will find it an admirable postscript to Bossuet. But is Mr. French willing to subscribe to the sentiments of Bossuet? Let me show you what are some of the opinions of the Eagle of Meaux, from his "Funeral Oration on the Death of the Chancellor of France." I read as follows:—

"Funeral Oration of Michael Le Tellier, Chancellor of France.

"Take up your sacred pens—the ready instruments of a ready writer—ye who compose the annals of the Church, and hasten to place, with a diligent hand, Louis among the Constantines and Theodosiuses. Those who have preceded you in this noble work relate, that before there were emperors, whose laws had deprived heretics of their meetings, the sects remained united, and long maintained themselves; but (continues Zozoman), as soon as God raised up Christian princes, and they prohibited these conventicles, the law did not permit the heretics to assemble in public, and the clergy, who watched over them, prevented them from doing so in private. By this means the greater part rejoined the Church, and the obstinate died without leaving successors, because they could neither hold communion with each other nor freely teach their doctrines. Thus fell heresy with its venom, and discord returned to hell, whence it had sprung. Behold, gentlemen, what our fathers admired in the first ages of the Church. But our fathers did not, like us, behold an inveterate heresy fall all at once; the stray sheep return in multitudes, and our churches too small to re-

ceive them; their false pastors abandon them without waiting for the order to do so, happy to allege their banishment for an excuse; everything calm in so great a change; the universe astonished at beholding so new an event, the most certain proof as well as the most excellent use of authority; and the merit of the prince more recognised and revered than ever his authority itself. Moved by such wonders, let us expand our hearts over the piety of Louis; let us raise our acclamations even to the heavens, and say to this new Constantine, this new Theodosius, this new Marcian, this new Charlemagne, what the six hundred and thirty fathers said formerly in the Council of Chalcedon: 'You have confirmed the faith; you have *exterminated the heretics*; this is the work which is worthy of your reign and its proper character. Through you heresy no longer exists; God alone has been able to effect this wonder. O King of Heaven, preserve the kings of the earth; it is the prayer of the Churches, it is the prayer of the bishops.'

"When the wise Chancellor received the order to draw up this *pious* edict, which inflicted the fatal blow on heresy, he had already felt the attack of the illness of which he died. But it was not right that a minister so zealous for *justice* should die with the regret of not having rendered it to all those whose affairs were prepared for it. Notwithstanding the fatal weakness which he began to feel, he heard, he judged, and he tasted the repose of a man happily disengaged, of whom neither the Church nor the world, nor his prince nor his country, nor individuals nor the public, had any longer anything to demand. *Only God reserved for him the accomplishment of the great work of religion;*

and he said, in sealing the revocation of the famous Edict of Nantes, that, after this triumph of the faith and so fine a monument of the king's piety, he no longer regretted finishing his days. These were the last words which he pronounced in the functions of his office—*words worthy to crown so glorious a ministry.*—*Works of Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux*, tom. xiii. Versailles, 1816.

Now this was pronounced after the revocation of Nantz, and with especial reference to that barbarous deed. Bossuet, in fact, whom you Roman Catholics have been accustomed to look up to as the defender of your Church, you have need to be ashamed of. He cherished bloodthirstiness. This man applauds the course of the king in the revocation of the edict of Nantz, and commends the king for imitating the conduct of those six hundred and thirty fathers who, "wrongfully," exclaims my opponent, approved the extermination of heretics. To renounce persecution, Romanists must throw away Popery. A council, composed of six hundred and thirty fathers, unanimously approve and decree the extermination of heretics. Bossuet, a writer of the Roman Catholic Church recommended to Protestants as a sainted model, applauds the revocation of the edict of Nantz, and quotes with high eulogium the antitype of that deed, embosomed in the edict of a subsequent monarch. Now, if bishops and councils of old cherished such principles, either the Roman Catholic Church has changed, or, if not, the Roman Catholic bishop of London, the Roman Catholic bishop of Dublin, and their courageous champion, Mr. French, hold anti-social and sanguinary tenets. If these learned priests and laymen approve of the bloody sentiments of Bossuet and Chalcedon, then they

are infinitely worse than I supposed them; but if they reject these sentiments, then you have not only another specimen of the unanimity of the Roman Catholic Church, but also a living proof of mutation and fallibility. Be sure to keep this fact before you. Every variation among professing Protestants which Mr. French shows, does not touch our safety or our creed, because our Rule of Faith is the Bible, and the Bible *alone*; but every variation, contradiction, and inconsistency which I show among the fathers, the doctors, and other representatives and expounders of the Romish faith, strikes at the very vitals of the Rule of Faith of the Roman Catholic Church.

I proceed now to quote from the Fathers. This will be tedious, but it is important. You will see THAT THE FATHERS FREQUENTLY CONTRADICT EACH HIMSELF AND EACH HIS NEIGHBOUR, AND, STILL MORE FREQUENTLY, THEY OPPOSE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH. You Roman Catholics claim the fathers: then hear the fathers against prayers in a tongue not understood by the congregation.

AUGUSTINE.

"They ought also to be aware that no voice reaches the ears of God which is unaccompanied with a feeling of the mind. These things ought doubtless to be corrected, that the people may say Amen to what is clearly understood."—*Catech. of Novices*, vol. i. p. 27. Bened. ed. Paris, 1685.

"We ought to understand that we may sing with human reason, not, as it were, with the voice of birds. Both thrushes, and parrots, and crows, and pies, are often taught by men to pronounce what they do not know; but to sing with understanding is granted by the

Divine will to mankind.”—*Exp. of 18th Psalm*, vol. iv. p. 82. Thus St. Augustine speaks against the present practice of the Church of Rome.

Again, continues Augustine :—

“Who is ignorant that canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament is contained within its own certain limits, and that it is to be preferred to all the subsequent writings of bishops, so that no one can doubt or dispute concerning it, whether whatsoever is written in it be true and right? But it is allowable to reprehend the writings of bishops which have been written after the established canon. And the councils themselves which are held in particular districts or provinces must yield without any scruple to the authority of plenary councils, which are collected from the whole Christian world, AND THESE PLENARY COUNCILS THEMSELVES MAY BE AMENDED, THE EARLIER BY LATER COUNCILS, when that is opened by experience which was shut, and that is known which was concealed.”—*On Bapt. ag. Donatists*, b. ii. c. iii.

“For whereas the Lord had done many things, all were not written, for the same Evangelist John testifies, both said and did many things which are not written, *but those things were selected to be written which were thought sufficient for the salvation of believers.*”—*On Gospel of John*, c. ii. to 49.

“It seemed a hard saying to them when he said, ‘Except any man eat my flesh, he shall not have eternal life.’ They received it foolishly, and they meditated upon it carnally, and thought that the Lord was about to cut off certain little pieces from his body, and to give them to them; and they said, ‘This is a hard saying. They were hard, and not the saying. For if

they had not been hard, but meek, they would have said within themselves, He does not say this for nothing, there is some hidden sacrament in it. * * *

“When his twelve disciples remained with him, the others having departed, they addressed him as if lamenting their death, because, being offended at his word, they had departed. But he taught them, and said to them, ‘It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and life.’ Understand *spiritually* what I have spoken. *You are not about to eat this body which you see, and to drink that blood which they shall shed who shall crucify me; I have recommended to you a certain sacrament, which, if spiritually understood, shall quicken you.*”—*Upon the 98th Psalm*.

Is the Church of Rome at war with Augustine on Transubstantiation? The Council of Trent and Pope Pius IV. are at the antipodes of these sentences from Augustine.

Purgatory Doubtful.

“It is not *incredible* that some such thing may take place even after this life, and we may require whether it is so, and it may either be found, or be hid from us; viz. that certain of the faithful, passing through a certain purgatorial fire, are sooner or later saved in proportion as they have more or less loved perishing things.”—*In the Enchiridion to Laurentius*, c. lxix. tom. vi. p. 222.

Thus Augustine regards purgatory as doubtful; therefore it was not an article of faith, in his judgment. How does this tally with the damnable definition of it by the Council of Trent?

Hear again “the glorious Augustine” protesting against the

Romish error, that the Virgin Mary, as the Mother of the Lord, is entitled to very high privileges and honours.

"It is written in the Gospel, that when the mother and brethren of Christ, that is, his relations after the flesh, were announced to him, and waited without, not being able to approach him by reason of the crowd, he answered, 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?' and pointing to his disciples, he said, 'These are my brethren; and whosoever shall perform the will of my Father, he is my brother, and mother, and sister.' What else did he teach us by this, but that we should prefer our spiritual to our carnal relationship; nor that men are therefore blessed because they are carnally related to righteous and holy men, but because they adhere to them by their obedience and their imitation of them in doctrines and morals? Mary, therefore, *was more blessed in adopting the faith of Christ, than in conceiving his flesh.* For when some one said to him, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee,' he answered, 'Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.' Lastly, What did that relationship profit his brethren, that is, his relations after the flesh, who did not believe in him? Thus also her maternal relationship would have profited Mary *nothing*, if she had not borne Christ more blessedly in her heart than in her flesh."—*Upon Holy Virginity*, c. iii. tom. vi. p. 342. Ed. as above.

"Wherefore, when the Lord appeared wonderful in the midst of the crowd, working signs and wonders, and showing what was hidden in the flesh, certain persons admiring, said, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee.' But he answered, 'Verily, blessed are they who hear

the word of God and keep it.' That is to say, My mother, whom thou hast called blessed, is thence blessed because she keeps the word of God, not because the Word was made flesh within her."—*Tenth Treatise on the 2nd chapter of St. John's Gospel*, tom. iii. p. 370.

Listen again to Augustine, protesting against the judicial power of the priests to forgive sins:—

"That passage in the Gospel, 'As my Father sent me, so also do I send you; when he had said this, he breathed upon them and said, Receive the Holy Ghost; if you forgive any sins they shall be forgiven, and if you retain them they shall be retained;' would be against us, so that we should be compelled to confess that this was done *by* men, and not by the *instrumentality* of men, if after he had said, 'And I also send you,' he had immediately added, 'Whose sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose sins ye retain they shall be retained.' But since the words are introduced, 'When he had said this he breathed upon them and said, Receive the Holy Ghost,' and then was conferred upon them either the remission or the retention of sins, it is sufficiently evident that *they themselves* did not do this, but the *Holy Spirit* by their agency; as he says in another place, 'It is not you that speak, but the Holy Spirit who is within you.'"—*Against the Letter of Parmenianus*, book ii. vol. ix. p. 42.

JEROME.

Mark by the following extracts how widely Jerome differs from the Roman Church that claims him.

The Scriptures the Sole Rule of Faith.

"The Church of Christ, which has churches in the whole world, is united by the unity of the Spirit,

and has the cities of the law, the prophets, the Gospel, and the apostles; she has not gone forth from her boundaries, that is, from the Holy Scriptures." — *Commentary upon Micah*, book i. tom. v. p. 334. Edition as before.

The Church.

"The Church does not consist of walls, but of true doctrine. *Wherever the true faith is, there is the Church.* Fifteen or twenty years ago, the heretics possessed all the walls of the churches that are here. Twenty years ago the heretics possessed all these churches. But the true Church was there where the true faith was." — *On the 133rd Psalm*, vol. vii. p. 388.

Anti-Supremacy.

"With the exception of ordination, what does a bishop do which an elder does not? The Church of the Roman city is not to be deemed one thing, and the Church of the whole world another. Gaul, and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and India, and all barbarous nations, adore one Christ and observe one rule of truth. If you look for authority, the world is greater than a city. *Whosoever a bishop is*, whether at Rome, or Constantinople, or Alexandria, or Tanais, *he is of the same worth* and the same priesthood. The power of riches and the humility of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower. But all are the successors of the apostles. Why do you produce to me the custom of one city?" — *To Eragrius*, tom. ii. p. 512. Printed at Paris, 1602.

"Bishops should recollect that they are greater than elders, rather by custom than by the truth of the Lord's appointment; and *that they ought to rule the Church in common.*" — *On the Epistle to Titus*, book i. c. i. vol. i. Edit. as above.

Christ the Rock.

"Christ is the rock, who granted to his apostles that they also should be called rocks." — *Upon Amos*, book iii. c. vi. vol. v. p. 265. Printed at Paris, 1602.

"And the foundations of the earth were manifested, the prophets and the apostles, upon whom the foundations of all the churches are placed." — *Upon the 17th Psalm*, vol. vii. p. 57. Edit. as above.

"We are all built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ our Lord the Cornerstone holding us together; and as we are founded on the prophets, so did the patriarchs also stand upon the foundation of the apostles." — *Second book of Commentaries to the Galatians*, c. iv. tom. vi. p. 308. Edit. as above.

"But the Catholic Church, which is founded with a firm root upon the rock Christ, stands as a perfect dove close to him upon his right hand, and has no evil in her. * * * — *To the Virgin Principia*, vol. iii. p. 173. Edit. as above.

Scripture the Sole Rule of Faith.

"But the word of God smites the other things, which they spontaneously discover, and feign as it were by an apostolical authority, without the authority and testimony of the Scriptures." — *Commentary on Haggai*, c. i. tom. v. p. 506. Edit. as above.

"The Lord will speak in the Scriptures of the people, in the holy Scriptures, which Scripture is read to all the people with the intent that all may understand it. What the Psalmist says, is this: As the apostles wrote, so also the Lord himself has spoken, that is, by the Gospels, not in order that a few, but in order that all may understand. Plato wrote scripturally, but he did not write to the

people, but to a few. Scarcely three persons understood him. But these, that is, the princes of the Church, and the princes of Christ, did not write to a few, but to the whole people. And see what he says of the princes, that is, of the apostles and evangelists who were in her. He says, who *were*, not who *are*; so that, with the exception of the apostles, whatsoever should afterwards be said *should be cut off*, should thenceforth have no authority."—*Jerome's Commentary on the 86th Psalm*, vol. vii. p. 259. Printed at Paris 1602.

On the Spirituality of the Church of Christ.

"The human soul is the only true temple of Christ. The Church of Christ is nothing but the souls of those who believe in Christ."—*Comm. on the 86th Psalm*, tom. vii.

"But the Church herself, which is the congregation of all the saints, on account of her eternal steadfastness in the Lord, is called the pillar and ground of truth."—*Com. on Job*, c. xxvii. tom. viii. p. 72.

"Let the Church be anxious to be united with Christ. But, mark, *the Church is the assembly of all the saints*."—*First Hom. on the Songs of Songs*, tom. viii. p. 299.

Canon of Scripture.

"But you must know that there are other books, which are not canonical, but were called by the ancients ecclesiastical, that is to say, the book of Wisdom, which is said to be Solomon's, and the other Wisdom, which is said to be the son of Sirach's; which book is called by the Latins by the general name of Ecclesiasticus, by which name not the author of the book, but the nature of the writing is declared. Of the same class is the book of Tobit, and Judith, and the books of Maccabees. And in the New Tes-

tament, the book of the Shepherd, or Hermes, which is called the Two Roads, or the Judgment of Peter; all of which they have thought fit to be read in the churches, but not to be brought forward for the confirmation of the faith.—*Symbol of Rufinus*, vol. ix. p. 186. Edit. as above.

"Whatsoever is without these is to be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom, which is commonly called the Wisdom of Solomon, and the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit, and the Shepherd, are not in the canon."—*Preface to the book of Kings*, vol. iii. book 24. Ed. as above.

Hear again Jerome, against the judicial power of the priests in forgiving sins:—

"The bishops and priests, not understanding that passage, assume to themselves somewhat of the arrogance of the Pharisees, so far as to imagine that they may condemn the innocent or absolve the guilty: whereas, with God, it is not the sentence of the priests, but the life of the guilty, that is looked into. We read in Leviticus concerning the lepers, where they were commanded to show themselves to the priests, in order that if they had a leprosy, they might be made unclean by the priests: not that the priests made them lepers and unclean, but because they knew who were lepers and who were not, and could discover who were clean and who were unclean. In the same manner therefore as the priest there made a man clean or unclean, so here the bishop or priest either binds or loosens not those who are innocent or guilty, but officially; when he has heard the nature of their sins, he knows who is to be bound and who is to be loosened."—*On the 16th chapter of Matthew*, vol. vi.

CHRYSOSTOM.

"He did not say, upon Peter, for he did not found his Church upon a man, but upon faith. What, therefore, means 'upon this rock?' Upon the confession contained in his words."—*Sermon upon Pentecost*, vol. vi. p. 233. Printed at Paris, 1621. Trin. Coll. Lib. Dublin.

"'And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church;' that is to say, upon the faith of the confession."—*Sermon 54 on the words of St. Matt.* Printed at Eton.

Against the Judicial Power of the Priests to forgive Sins.

"For truly it is in the power of God only to forgive sins." Printed at Mentz.

Against the Necessity of Auricular Confession.

"For this reason I entreat and beseech and pray you to confess continually to God. For I do not bring thee into the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor do I compel thee to discover thy sins to men. Uncover your conscience to God, and show him thy wounds, and seek a cure from him."—*5th Sermon on the Incomprehensible Nature of God.* Paris, 1621.

"But now it is not necessary to confess your sins to witnesses who are present; let the inquiry of thy offences be made in thy thought, let this judgment be without a witness, let God only see thee confessing."—*Sermon on Repentance and Confession*, tom. v. *Latin Ed. quoted by Ab. Usher, in his reply to a Jesuit.*

No need of any Minor Intercessors with God.

"When we want any thing from men, we have need of cost and money, and servile adulation, and much going up and down, and great ado. For it falleth out oftentimes that we cannot go straight unto the

lords themselves and present our gifts unto them and speak with them, but it is necessary for us first to procure the favour of their ministers, and stewards, and officers, both by payments and words, and all other means; and then by their mediation to obtain our request. But with God it is not thus, for there is no need of intercessors for the petitioners; neither is he so ready to give a gracious answer when entreated by others, as by ourselves praying unto them."—*Chrys. on Matt. cited by Theodorus in his Eclogues, and quoted by Archb. Usher in his answer to a Jesuit.*

"God is always nigh; but if thou wilt entreat man, thou askest what he is doing, and he is asleep, he is not at leisure, or the servant giveth thee no answer. But with God there are none of these things. Whithersoever thou goest and callest, he heareth; there is no need of leisure, nor of a mediator, nor of a servant to keep thee off. Say, Have mercy upon me, and presently God is with thee. For while thou art yet speaking, he saith, I will say, Behold, here I am. * * * And mark the philosophy of the woman of Canaan. She entreats not James, she beseeches not John, neither does she come to Peter, but she breaks through the whole company of them, saying, I have no need of a mediator; but, taking repentance with me for a spokeswoman, I come to the fountain itself. For this cause did he descend, for this cause did he take flesh, that I might have boldness to speak unto him. I have no need of a mediator; have thou mercy upon me."—*Upon the sending away of the woman of Canaan.* Printed at Paris, 1621. Trin. Coll. Lib. Dublin.

My dear Roman Catholic auditors, follow for once the advice of Chrysostom in the following extract.

If your priest refuse you permission, tell him Chrysostom gives it you:—

On the words, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly."

"* * * Hear, ye who are men of the world, and govern a wife and children, how he enjoins you in particular to know the Scriptures, and not lightly, nor as it may be, but with great diligence. * * *

"Hear, I exhort you, all men engaged in the affairs of life, and obtain for yourselves books, the medicine of the soul. If you will have nothing else, get the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Gospels, as your constant teachers. * * *

"*Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of all evils.* We go unarmed to the battle."—*On Epist. to Coloss.* chap. iii. hom. ix. Printed at Mentz.

"And this I always exhort, and will not cease to exhort, that you not only attend to the things that are spoken, but also that, when you are at home, you apply diligently to the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; and I have never omitted constantly to inculcate this upon those who come to me in private. And let no one repeat those stale and much-to-be-censured words, I am engaged in the forum, I have public business, I have a trade, 'I am a married man, I support a family, I am engaged in domestic affairs, I am a man engaged in the things of this life, it is not for me to read the Scriptures, but for those who have taken a farewell of the world, who dwell in the tops of mountains, and constantly live after that fashion.' What sayest thou, O man? Is it not thy business to study the Scriptures, because thou art distracted with a thousand cares? It is thine much more than it is theirs."—*3rd Sermon on Lazarus.*

"For he did not say, Read, but 'Search the Scriptures,' since the things that are said of him require much research. For this reason he commands them to dig with diligence, that they may discover the things that lie deep."—*Hom. xl. on the 5th chapter of the Gospel of St. John.*

ORIGEN.

The Sufficiency of Scripture.

"As all gold, whatsoever it be, that is without the temple, is not holy; so every sense, which is without the divine Scripture, however admirable it may appear to some, is not holy, because it is foreign to the Scripture."—*25th Hom. upon Matt.* Latin edit. Basil.

"And there a vigilant perception and an earnest mind are required, which can discern either the simplicity of the sheep in the fold, or the latent rapacity of the wolf. Consider how imminent their danger is, who neglect to study the Scriptures, in which *alone* the discernment of this matter can be ascertained."—*Book x. c. xvi. upon Romans.* Edit. as above.

"There is in the New Testament a letter which killeth him who does not understand spiritually the things which are said. For if you take this according to the letter, 'Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood, *this letter killeth.*'"—*Hom. vii. on the 10th chapter of Leviticus.* Latin edit. Basil, 1571.

ATHANASIUS. (Flourished about the year 335 or 340.)

Against Creature Worship.

"Peter the apostle admonished Cornelius, who desired to worship him, saying, 'I also am a man.' The angel in the Apocalypse admonished John, who desired to worship him, saying, 'See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep

the sayings of this book : worship God.' Therefore, it appertains to God only to be worshipped : and the angels themselves are aware of this ; for, although they surpass others in glory, they are all creatures, and are not beings to be worshipped, but beings who worship the Lord. The angel, therefore, admonished Manoah the father of Sampson, who wished to sacrifice to him, saying, Offer not to me, but to God."—*Third Oration against the Arians*. Printed at Paris, 1627.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.

Against Purgatory.

"For I think that we ought to decide it, as being highly probable that the souls of the saints, when they have departed from their bodies, are commended unto God's goodness, as unto the hands of a most dear Father; and do not remain in the earth, as some unbelievers have imagined, until they have had the honour of burial, neither are carried, as the souls of the wicked are, unto a place of immeasurable punishment, that is unto hell ; but rather fly to the hands of the Father of all, our Saviour Christ, having first prepared his way for us. For he delivered up his soul to the Father, that from it and by it, a beginning being made, we might have certain hope of this thing, firmly believing that after death we shall be in the hands of God, and shall live a far better life than when we were in the flesh. Wherefore, the wise Paul instructs us, that it is better to be dissolved, and to be with Christ."—*On the Gospel of John*, book 12, tom. iv. p. 1069. Printed at Paris, 1638.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

On the Canon of Scripture.

"Of these books read two and twenty, but have nothing in com-

mon with the Apocrypha."—*Cat. iv.* Printed at Oxford, 1703.

The Scriptures the Standard of Faith.

"Not even the least of the divine and holy mysteries of the faith ought to be handed down without the divine Scriptures. * * *

"Do not simply give faith to me who produce these things, except you have the proof of what I say from the divine Scriptures. For the security and preservation of our faith are not supported by ingenuity of speech, but by the proof of the divine Scriptures."—*Cat. iv.* p. 56. Edit. as above.

Cyril was one of those fathers who were most bitterly accused by other fathers. Rufinus and Jerome attack him more unmercifully, thereby proving the unanimity of the fathers !

JUSTIN MARTYR, A.D. 150.

Against the Mass and Transubstantiation.

"I also affirm that the prayers and praises of the saints are the only perfect sacrifices acceptable to God. For these only have the Christians undertaken to perform ; and by the commemoration of the wet and dry food, in which we call to mind the sufferings which the God of gods suffered through Him, whose name the high priests and scribes have caused to be profaned and blasphemed throughout the earth."—*Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*. Paris, 1515, p. 345.

EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA.

Anti-Transubstantiation.

"For he gave again to his disciples the symbols of the Divine economy, and he commanded them to make the image of his own body."—*Evangelical Demonstrations*, book viii. c. i. Paris, 1544.

"He appointed them to use bread as a symbol of his own body."—*From the same*. Edit. as above.

THEODORET, BISHOP OF CYRUS, IN
SYRIA.

Against Angel Worship.

"Because they commanded men to worship angels, he enjoins the contrary, namely, that they should adorn their words and their deeds with the commemoration of our Lord Jesus Christ. Send up thanksgiving, he says, to God the Father, through him, and not through angels. The Council of Laodicea, also following this rule, and desiring to heal that old disease, made a law that people should not pray unto angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ.—*On the third chapter of the Colossians. The Greek is quoted by Usher in his Answer to a Jesuit. The passage has been verified in the Latin edition.* Printed at Paris, 1608.

"This vice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long time, for which cause the council assembled at Laodicea forbade them by a law to pray to angels."—*From the same, quoted by Usher, and verified as above.*

Salvation by Grace.

"The salvation of man depends upon the Divine philanthropy alone. For we do not gather it as the wages of our righteousness, but it is the gift of the Divine goodness."—*On the 3rd chapter of Zephaniah.*

GREGORY NAZIANZEN.

The True Succession.

"He is elevated to the chair of Mark, not less the successor of his piety than of his seat. In point of time very distant from him, but in piety, which indeed is properly called succession, directly after him; for he that holdeth the same doctrine is of the same chair, but he who is an enemy to the doctrine is an enemy to the chair."—*21st Oration in Praise of Athanasius.* Paris, 1778.

TERTULLIAN.

Anti-Transubstantiation.

"The bread which he had taken and distributed to his disciples he made his body, by saying, This is my body, that is, *the figure* of my body."—Printed at Paris, 1675.

"Wherefore, because they thought his saying hard and intolerable, as if he had really decreed that his flesh was to be eaten by them, in order that he might place salvation in the spirit, he first said, 'It is the Spirit which quickeneth,' and then added, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' that is to say, to quickening. And what he meant by the spirit, follows.

AMBROSE.

Against the Judicial Power of the Priests in Forgiving Sins.

"Behold! sins are pardoned by the Holy Spirit. But men bring a *ministry* for the remission of sins; they do not exercise the right of any power."—*On the Holy Spirit*, book iii. c. xviii. Edit. as above.

Anti-Supremacy of Power.

"But what do you tell me? Immediately, not unmindful of his place, he enacted the primacy; a primacy of confession, not of honour, a primacy of faith, and not of order."—*On the Mystery of our Lord's Incarnation.*

"Therefore, let no one boast of his works, because no one can be justified by his works: but he who just receives it as a gift, because he is justified by the washing of regeneration. It is faith, therefore, which delivers us by the blood of Christ, because 'Blessed is he whose sins are forgiven, and to whom pardon is granted.'"—*Letter 73.* Edit. as above.

BASIL.

The Scriptures the Rule of Faith.

"It is a falling from the faith, and a crime of the greatest pride,

to desire to take away from the Scriptures, or to introduce anything that is not written. For Christ says that his sheep hear his voice, and not the voice of another."—*In his Discourse upon Faith*. Bened. Edit. Printed at Paris, 1722.

Justification by Faith.

"As it is written, 'Let him that boasteth, boast in the Lord.' For this is the perfect and complete boasting in God, that no one is extolled on account of his own righteousness, but knows that he, being destitute of real righteousness, is justified by faith only in Christ. And Paul boasts in despising his own righteousness, and in seeking that which is of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."—*Hom. on Humility*. Edit. as above.

CYPRIAN.

Anti-Supremacy.

"The other apostles were, the same as Peter, *endowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power*; but the beginning proceeded from unity, that the Church of Christ might be shown to be one."—*On the Unity of the Church*, p. 107. Printed at Oxford.

Anti-Purgatory.

"It is for him to fear death, who is not willing to go to Christ. It is for him to be unwilling to go to Christ, who does not believe that he begins to reign with Christ. For it is written, that 'the just lives by faith.' If thou art just and livest by faith, if thou dost truly believe in God, why, being about to be with Christ, and being secure of the Lord's promise, dost thou not embrace the message whereby thou art called to Christ, and rejoice that thou art rid of the devil? Simeon said, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word, for mine eyes hath seen

thy salvation.' Proving thereby, and witnessing, that the servants of God then have peace, then enjoy free and quiet rest, when, being drawn from these storms of the world, we seek the haven of an eternal peace and safety; when, having paid the penalty of death, we arrive at immortality."—*Cyprian on Death*, sec. ii. p. 157. Oxford, 1682.

Anti-Images.

"Why do you bow down and humble yourselves to false gods? Why do you slavishly bend before silly images, and the works of men's hands? God hath made you upright: to other animals indeed he has given a different shape and figure, and made them look downwards on the earth; but you were formed erect, and your countenance was designed to look up to God. To him look up as you were made to do, and seek him in his holy habitation, which is in the highest heaven. Forsake, therefore, these idols which human error has invented. Turn to God, who will help you if you supplicate him."—*To Demetrius*, p. 191. Oxford, 1682.

Against the Judicial Power of the Priests in Forgiving Sins.

"Let no man deceive, let no man beguile himself. The Lord only can have mercy. He alone can grant pardon for the sins which are committed against Him who bore our sins, who sorrowed for us, whom God delivered for our sins."—*Cyprian on those who had fallen from the Faith*, sect. vii. Edit. as above.

HILARY.

Against Purgatory.

"There is hope of future good, when, departing from this body into the entrance of the heavenly kingdom, all the faithful shall be preserved in the custody of the Lord,

being placed meanwhile in the bosom of Abraham, the approach to which is forbidden to the wicked by an intervening gulf."—*Hilary on the 120th Psalm*, p. 978. Paris, 1652.

None can be aided by the merits of others.

"No one can be aided by the good works or merits of others, because each must buy oil for his own lamp."—*Can. 27*, p. 591. Edit. as above.

Scriptures the Rule of Faith.

"Do you seek the faith, O Emperor? Hear it, then, not from new writings, but from the books of God."—*To Constantius Augustus*, p. 244.

Salvation by Faith only.

"Salvation is to be expected from faith."—*Comm. on Matt.* Paris, 1652.

"Wages cannot be considered as a gift, because they are due to work, but God has given free grace to all men by the justification of faith."—*Comm. on Matt. c. xx.* p. 588. Edit. as above.

CLEMENS ROMANUS.

Justification by Faith.

"All therefore have been glorified and magnified, not by their own works, or the just actions which they have performed, but by his will. And we, therefore, being called according to his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, nor by our wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, nor by the works which we have wrought in holiness of heart, but by faith, by which the omnipotent God has justified all from eternity: and to him be glory for ever and ever. Amen."—*1st Epist. to the Corinthians*, c. xxxii. Cambridge, 1718.

POPE GREGORY THE FIRST,
Consecrated Bishop of Rome, A.D. 590.

"But I confidently say, that who-

soever calls himself universal bishop, or desires to be called so, in his pride, is the forerunner of antichrist, because in his pride he prefers himself to the rest. And he is conducted to error with a similar pride; for as that wicked one wishes to appear a god above all men, so who-soever he is who alone desires to be called a bishop, extols himself above all other bishops."—*Book vii. indication 15, epist. 33. To Mauricius Augustus.* Edit. as above.

I have thus produced the most startling extracts from the Fathers—startling, I know, to my Roman Catholic auditors. I say the fathers are vastly more Protestant than Papist in their theology. No Roman Catholic dare prove this untrue. If half-and-half, their testimony is thereby neutralized. As it is, however, there is a preponderance of patristic theology in favour of Scriptural Christianity, and against the innovations and corruptions of the Church of Rome. But though the fathers are far more friendly to Protestantism than to Popery, such is the force of sacred writ—such is its support of our common Protestant faith—such is its eloquence, and awful protestations against the monstrous dogmas of the papacy, that I can cheerfully afford to make my opponent a present of all the fathers. I am amply satisfied with that blessed and glorious book which teaches all Christians what they are to believe, how to live, and, blessed be God, which also teaches them what they are to enjoy—how to die.—[Sensation.]

[The reverend gentleman's hour here closed.]

MR. FRENCH.—Ladies and gentlemen—My learned antagonist is, you may perceive, as usual, totally unrivalled in the happy art of giving great weight to very trifling ob-

servations by the earnestness of his manner, and of embellishing those *meræ nugæ*—those illustrious trifles—with all the pomp of sound, and all the varied harmony of language. What a fortunate circumstance, my friends, would it not be for the numerous gazing admirers that are to be found in that phalanx now thickening around him, if he were but half as solicitous for the strength and collocation of solid arguments as he is for the construction of his unmeaning sentences and the flashes of his wit! Indeed, my friends, I know not what may be the sentiments of his admirers upon the present occasion, but it does strike me most forcibly, that when our mutual efforts come to be contrasted to each other on paper, my reverend opponent will make but a very sorry figure. [Laughter.] I am happy, however, extremely happy, to congratulate myself that he has touched upon several points which I wish to illustrate this evening. I knew not well, indeed, how to bring them in, in a manner that should not appear abrupt to my audience, and I thank my reverend friend for having smoothed the way for that purpose. It struck me that a word or two more ought to have been said with reference to that inexpressibly-momentous subject, which constitutes, after all, the vitality of religion—the blessed and adorable Eucharist. It struck me likewise that, after all the calumnies that are disseminated throughout England by that peregrinating society, to which the learned gentleman belongs (the Reformation Society), against the doctrine of Confession, that a few words ought to be said by way of contradiction and refutation of them. I shall, therefore—deferring an answer to the trivial objections of my learned friend concerning different points in our religion—immediately

take up the objections made to the doctrine of the Eucharist by my learned friend from garbled extracts from the fathers of the Church, and then I shall proceed to vindicate the doctrine of Confession by the authority of those very fathers which my friend has quoted.

It is very extraordinary, ladies and gentlemen, and I know not how to account for it, considering his better knowledge, that from the commencement of this discussion my learned friend has strained every nerve to prove to you that, upon the fundamental tenets of our religion, the fathers are all at war with one another. I maintain, on the contrary, and have been struggling with equal vehemence and pertinacity to maintain and prove to you, that the fathers, upon all the momentous articles of our religion, are perfectly concordant and unanimous. My friend, however, has been endeavouring to impress upon you that it is not the case. Now, I am very willing to make this concession to my learned friend, viz., if I take certain passages from Augustine, or Cyprian, or Chrysostom, and others, in the *abstract*, they may perchance make against the doctrine both of Confession and the Eucharist, in the same manner as I concede, when I am disputing with an Unitarian—and I have disputed with them in every part of England—in the same manner as I concede to them, on certain passages of the Bible, that, taken in the abstract merely, we find certain passages declaring that Christ is only man; and in that respect I must so concede it. If you take that passage in the Bible which says that the day of judgment was not known even to Christ, why, it immediately occurs that he is not the all-knowing, the omniscient God, knowing all things; and that, therefore, he is a being of limited power

of capacity. But how is that objection to be confronted? Just in the same manner as that with which I am going to crush and to confound my opponent on the present occasion. He has brought forward to you with great ingenuity certain passages from St. Austin, which were meant by that father to be merely illustrative of the manner in which the sacrament should be taken, in opposition to the false notion of the Jews and others, that they were eating real flesh, like that sold in the market. But how will my learned friend, with all his ingenuity, and with all the ingenuity of any Protestant polemic, ever overturn or do away with the force of this irresistible passage? Hear, my friends, ye who are able to lift up your hearts to God, and to implore that he would deign to bestow upon you the rays of truth, and to cause the expulsion of prejudice,—listen to what he says!—for, if a man comes into this room determined to turn a deaf ear to all argument, I despair at once of converting that man; but as to those who are totally unprejudiced on this momentous subject, I think it is impossible that they can leave this room without coinciding with the views of Catholics.

The first passage which I take is the following from the great St. Augustine, and it has been made to say, by the dexterity of my friend, that there is nothing but an empty figure in the sacrament of the Eucharist, though he (Augustine) uses these remarkable words—“*Suscipit*——” But I will read you the English, unless [turning to Mr. Cumming,] my friend wishes to hear the Latin?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—No, no.

Mr. FRENCH—[in continuation.] “For Christ took earth from earth (flesh being made of earth),

and this flesh he took from the flesh of Mary; and because he conversed with us in the flesh he gave us this same flesh to eat for our salvation. But no one eats that flesh *without adoring it first*. Not only is it no sin to adore it, but we sin if we adore it not.”—*St. Aug. Enarr. in Psalm*. Edit. Bened. vol. iv. pars 2.

Now these are the words to which I specially call the attention of my friend, and of every Protestant friend in this room. Now, I ask you, my Protestant friends, When you approach to your Sacrament, do you adore the bread? No; you do not, because you do not believe Christ to be there—because ye do not listen to the teaching of that church, of which the same St. Augustine says:—“Whosoever is separated from this Catholic Church, how laudably soever he may imagine himself to live, yet *for this one only crime*, that he is sundered from the unity of Christ, shall be excluded from eternal life, and the anger of God remains upon him.”—*St. Aug.* vol. ii. page 45, epist. 141. Edit. Bened. [Whispering about the Rev. J. Cumming’s quarter of the platform, Mr. French pausing.] I request silence in the room; this is a most important thing, and to be obstructed by murmurs and noise, it is extremely unfair. [Silence restored, the learned gentleman continued as follows:—]

We have here, then, Augustine’s stamp of authenticity as to the real doctrine of the Catholic Eucharist, and we see also, that, according to my friend, he is a rank idolater. He tells us that we must “adore it”—my reverend friend tells us that we *must not*. And how is my friend to extricate St. Augustine from the charge of idolatry, who, not only takes the Sacrament after

having adored it, but tells us that "we sin if we adore it not?"

But let us hear this most faithful interpreter of all antiquity, as Calvin styles him, a little more copiously:—"As you know, the sacrifice of the Jews, according to the rite of Aaron, consisted in the offerings of beasts, and this in mystery; as yet the sacrifice of the body and the blood of the Lord was not, *which the faithful understand*, and they who have read the Gospel; *which sacrifice is now diffused through the whole world.*"—*Enarr. in Psalm xxxiii. t. iv. p. 210.*

Again,—“Wherefore the sacrifice of Aaron was taken away, and that according to the order of Melchizedek commenced. Our Lord was willing that our salvation should be in his body and blood, and this was an effect of his humility; for, had he not been humble, *he would not have been to us meat and drink.*”—*Ibid. p. 211.*

Again, and here the words are so remarkably emphatic, and so totally unadapted to the Protestant conception of the sacrament, that I must first give the Latin and then the English:—"Ferebatur Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans *ipsum corpus suum*, ait, Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim *illud corpus* in manibus suis:" "Christ was held in his own hands when, committing to us his body itself, he said, This is my body. For he bore *that body* in his hands."—*St. Aug. vol. iv. p. 214.*

Again—"Nisi enim esset humilis, nec manducaretur, nec biberetur:" "For had he not been humble, he would not have thus been to us meat and drink."—*Ibid. vol. iv. p. 211.*

Again—"For he spoke to us of his body and his blood: his body, he said, was food; his blood, drink."

And again—"Since they eat *his*

very flesh and drink *his very blood.*" Vol. v. p. 391.

And lastly—"Wherefore of his body and blood he gave us 'salubrem refectionem:' 'a salutary banquet or refreshment.'"—Vol. v. p. 640.

"Sicut mediatorem Dei et hominum Christum Jesum, *carnem suam* nobis manducandam, bibendumque *sanguinem* dicentem, *fideli corde atque ore* suscepimus, quamvis horribilius videatur *humanam carnem manducare* quàm perimere, et *humanum sanguinem* potare, quàm fundere."—*St. Aug. advers. Legis et Proph. lib. ii. cap. ix. vol. viii. p. 599.*

"As we receive with a faithful heart and mouth the Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus, who tells us that *his body is to be eaten and his blood is to be drunk*; although it may appear more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to shed it."

Lastly—and the words will be an eternal puzzle for my learned antagonist so long as he lives, to subtilize their adaptation to Protestant theology:—(*De verb. Evang. Johan. serm. 131, v. 5, p. 640*) "Durus est, sed duris, incredibilis est, sed incredulis:" "They themselves (some of his disciples) exclaimed, 'This is a hard saying; who can hear it? It is hard, ay, to those who are themselves hard; it is incredible, ay, to those who are themselves incredulous.'"

Now, all these words of St. Austin are totally incomprehensible and unintelligible, unless we suppose that he is talking of the Catholic Sacrament. But St. Austin, in the passage quoted by my antagonist, is merely alluding to the mode in which some persons imagine this Sacrament was to be taken. They imagined that it was real blood they were taking, though not per-

ceivable to the taste, and real pieces of flesh they were eating. For instance, if you were to take a piece of flesh from the Saviour's body, that would not be a sacrament. That is not the mode; it must be animated by his immortal soul and his Eternal Spirit. It is Jesus whole and entire, in the same way that he appeared in the midst of his disciples after death without disturbing the walls of the room in which they were assembled. It is that food, that transcendantly glorious body, which we take in the Sacrament; and if you can believe that he actually did come among the disciples without disturbing the walls or the doors, I can believe it, and you, my friends, can just as easily believe, that the God of heaven, Jesus Christ, is taken in the sacramental manner in which we glory in receiving him, and from which we receive such inexpressible delight. St. Austin makes Christ himself to say, interpreting his words, Ye are not to eat this body as ye now see it, but this same body, being in a spiritualized and invisible manner in the sacrament, ye are to eat, or *ye have no life in you.*

"What, therefore," continues our glorious interpreter, "what means the phrase, *The flesh profiteth nothing?* It profiteth nothing in the manner in which they understood it, for they understood it to mean "flesh as it is mangled in a dead body, or as it is sold in the market, not as it is quickened by the animating spirit of life."

Such, my friends, are the all-explanatory words of the great St. Augustine; and, to quicken, if possible, the drowsy ear of my learned antagonist, let me resound in it the last words of the memorable sentence, in the grand sonorous accents of the original:—"Quomodo in cadavere laniatur, aut in macello

venditur, non quomodo spiritu vegetatur."—*Tract 27, v. 3, p. 503.*

That is what St. Austin is pointing out. The learned gentleman, by separating the body of one sentence from the other, spoils the point and meaning of the whole; he makes it appear to be all an empty figure. But then comes the interpreter of the Catholic Church, with a solid phalanx of quotation, and makes my friend blush in secret, though you do not perceive it on his cheek. [Laughter.] No, my friends, take any one father of the Church, Greek or Latin, and they one and all declare that it is the *real* body and blood, and that unless you take it so, you have no life within you. But then there is a figure in the eating, that is, that we are not sensible of tasting the blood in the body: that is figurative, we grant, and St. Augustine grants it. But there is one strong irresistible fact you have before you from Augustine, and which will for ever stand, though my friend may pour forth speech after speech, full of all the flowers of a gaudy rhetoric, but he will never do away with this solemn fact—that *it is* the *flesh* of Christ; that we must adore that flesh when we approach the sacramental table; and that we sin if we adore it not. My ingenious friend, however, imagines, that by a single isolated passage from St. Augustine, where that father says to a catechumen—"Oh, why do you prepare your teeth to eat? Believe, and you have received," that he has at once annihilated the whole force of the above-cited clear, invincible extracts which I have laid before you. Why, if so—if mere believing in Christ constitute the sacrament, what need, I ask—I will not say of the Catholic reception, but—of the bread and wine according to the usage of Pro-

testants? My friend, you see, in this his endeavour to bring in the authority of St. Augustine as *subversive* of our tenet, by the application of the self-same words will subvert his own.

And now a few words as to the subject of Confession, which is much the subject of ridicule in every part of England to which the Association of Exeter Hall sends its emissaries—I mean the doctrine of Confession. We are supposed, my friends, to have a great facilitation towards the committing of crimes in our Church; but it is not so. If the Catholic commits a sin of a deadly nature, one that gives him remorse, what are the first steps he takes? Does he beg of the priest absolution? No! but, precisely the same as the Protestant who is touched with compunction, and who has recourse to resuscitating; he goes to his chamber, or to some retired place; he falls upon his knees to his God, without reference or thought of his priest; he cries out to the Lord Jesus to forgive him; “I have sinned, O Lord my God; I have sinned,” he says, “against thee, and I am no longer worthy to be called thy Son; Oh blot out my sins, I beseech thee, ineffably sweet and benignant Lord Jesus, and I will struggle, with all the powers of my soul, for the future, never to commit them again. And yet, O God, such is the frailty of my nature, that, if I confide in myself, I must inevitably fall. It is in thee, and in thee alone, I repose, my God: Oh give me grace to wash away this deadly sin I have committed, and give me, O Father, thy grace that I may never fall into it again. On thee and thee alone do I rely.” What does he do after that? Is he content with a flood of tears, or is he content with imploring his God in the

manner in which I have painted him? No; for again and again, day after day, he examines himself to see that there is no temptation to sin still remaining in him; that temptation that has destroyed the peace of his soul. And when he has done this—when he is satisfied that there is a true conversion, as far as his own soul can inform him—when he has done this, and not before, he approaches and discloses his sin to the priest of God; not that the priest can of himself forgive him, but as an instrument in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and when he has heard the confession of his sins, he says to him, “I absolve thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; go, son, and sin no more.” But mark, my friends, if a Catholic were to rush, without having uttered a word of importunity to his God for pardon, after committing a mortal sin, to the tribunal of confession, even if he sincerely tell his sin for the sake of absolution, he heaps up damnation upon himself; he is damned to all eternity, even according to every Catholic catechism that ever was written. And why? Because he has not implored pardon of his God, and excited sentiments of compunction in his soul; and if he were to excite compunction for one sin, or for twenty, and knowingly omit *one*, all his confession is sacrilegious.

And now, gentlemen, as we have had a great deal of prosaic reading on the part of my reverend friend, (I confess I should like to have had a little of his brilliant oratory [laughter]; but he has fallen into dull reading to night,) I shall give you a little poetry in return; but first I shall give you something from your orthodox book [*holding*

up one]—this is the Protestant Rubric. I read as follows:—
PROTESTANT ABSOLUTION OF SINS!!!

“Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession *the priest shall absolve him* (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort:—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences, and *by his authority committed to me, I ABSOLVE THEE FROM ALL THY SINS, IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST. AMEN.*”—*The Visitation of the Sick, from the Book of Common Prayer, &c. according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland.*

Now, gentlemen, you retain many of the *shadows* of Christianity in your Church, and here is an instance of it. But what I can prove to you most satisfactorily is, that, from the days of the apostles, before the enlightened (!) period of the Reformation, the doctrine of Confession was inculcated as a doctrine of Christianity; and though, my friends, this is poetry—feeble poetry, and my own, which I am going to read you, yet it embodies great and solemn truths, in a very pithy manner, such as my learned friend *ought* to relish, though I am afraid he will not. [Tittering]. For its motto I have taken the text—“And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.”—*St. John* xx. 22, 23. To which text, as an early comment, I have appended a comment of Origen, who flourished A.D. 203:—

“They who are not holy die in their sins: the holy do penance; they feel their wounds; they look for the priest; they implore health; and through him seek to be purified.”—*Orig. Hom. 10. tom. ii. p. 302.*

And again—“If we discover our sins, not only to God, *but to those who may apply a remedy to our wounds and iniquities*, our sins will be effaced by Him who said—‘I have blotted thy iniquities as a cloud, and thy sins as a mist.’”—*Isaiah* xlv. 22.—*Hom. 17 in Lucam*:—

Say, Protestant, whose mind no clouds o’ercast,
All-knowing in the annals of the past,
In what dark period, at what slumbering hour,
Obtain’d the priest Confession’s mighty power?

What sly, heretical, unhallow’d sect
First dar’d that grand tribunal to erect?
Near the first century Tertullian wrote:
Say, was the doctrine in that age afloat?
“I own,” he cries, “that to confess is hard,
But, oh! to be eternally debarr’d
The gates of heav’n, if aw’d by worldly shame
My soul its filth should shudder to proclaim!
If hard to suffer, suffering is for sins,
The suffering ends, and spiritual health begins

When penance is perform’d; why fly the hand
Appointed to absolve by Heav’n’s command?”*

Tertullian thus, in *unreforming* times,
And with his language every father chimes;
All preach alike, “Confession’s healthy spring

In the Church rose from its Celestial King.
In times all-primitive great Cyprian hear!
The witness, martyr, and the saint revere.
“Oh, my dear brethren, I entreat you all,
Confess your sins, while ye have power to fall
At the priest’s feet; while ye enjoy life’s breath,
While pardon may prevent the gates of death.”†

Tell me then, Protestant, of pondering mind
Where, turning o’er historic deeds, ye find
The priest of old this galling yoke invent,
Beneath whose weight, kings, priests, and nations bent.

* Tertullian wrote in the year of our Lord 194.—*De Penitentia*, c. ix. p. 168. Edit. Rothomagi, 1662.

† St. Cyprian wrote in the year of our Lord 248.—*De Lapsis*, p. 190. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1726.

When was the Church thus suddenly defil'd?
When by the shepherd was the flock be-
gull'd?

In some dark age did it at first take wing,
Or from *tradition*, uncorrupted spring?

Did God's true priests in guilty league com-
bine

To substitute the human for divine,
And whilst of sinners God required alone
A contrite heart all wanderings to atone,
Did God's true priest deface the well known
road,

And add Confession to the sinner's load?
Oh, miracle too wondrous! to suppose
Confession thus through Christendom arose!
That priests should usher in, in heaven's
despite,

A spurious, false, unapostolic rite!
And *that*, where Christ had promised to
abide

For ever with his Church, and be its Guide!
Say, from such sources could *Confession*
flow?

Could God's own Church become his deadliest
foe?

"*They are forgiv'n whose sins ye shall for-
give.*"

Says the sweet voice that bids the sinner
live;

"*They are retain'd, whose sins ye shall
retain.*" *

Says the same voice; now, all these words
are vain,

Unless the penitent his sins explores,
And shows unto the priest his inward sores;
Unless the sinner shall his sins confess,
The priest must pardon or retain by guess.
Reflect then, Protestants, can mortal sin
Be blotted out by sighs and groans within;
Or must the humble penitent repair
To the *true priest*, that clings to Peter's
chair—

There lowly bent, with firm resolve no more
To tread the guilty paths he trod before,
To sue forgiveness of his Saviour's grace,
Whilst words absolving all his sins efface!
Or has the Church of ages vainly taught
A lawless rite with man's invention fraught,
That turns an easy to a galling yoke,
And bids the soul man's mercy to invoke,
And not his God's—ah, no! that mercy
crave

Of God alone, who hath the power to save;
But if God's love within thy bosom burn,
Becomes it thee God's holiest Church to
spurn?

That Church, which whoso shall disdain to
hear,

In vain may shed the penitential tear,
Upon its holiest Founder call in vain;
Deep in his soul the cank'ring sins remain.
The root original of sin was pride;
This prompts the sinner *still* his sins to
hide

From sight of mortal eye;—this bids him
blush,

While Satan, pride applauding, whispers
Hush!

But, oh! the last, the dire tremendous day,
Which shall dark guilt in all its folds display!

With what remorse, what anguish and dis-
tress,

Shall blushing cheeks foul thoughts and
deeds confess!

In vain shall pride put forth her daring plea,
"O Lord! my sins I have confess'd to thee."

"What says the Church whom I enaugh'd with
power?"

Shall thunder forth in that tremendous
hour.

"Whose sins *ye shall retain*, they are re-
tained,

Whose sins *ye shall forgive* they are un-
stained;

He that hears you, hears me; the proud and
wise

Despising you, me also will despise." *

Now, to come to another subject.
When I said, my friends, my re-
spected Protestant and Catholic
friends—when I said that I could
give a better translation of the
New Testament than that which we
have in English—better than the
Protestant Bible, I did not mean to
speak vainly or arrogantly; I merely
meant to say I could alter many in-
accuracies in the Catholic transla-
tion as to Gallicisms of language,
and ameliorate the Protestant trans-
lation, not as to language, but in
giving a force to certain words,
such as I am going to illustrate at
the present moment, where it is
false in the English version, and
where I could improve the version
by making it nearer the original.
For instance, when Christ said to
Peter, John xx. 16: *ποιμαίνε τὰ
 πρόβατα μου*, why does not the
Protestant translation give the
strength, the significance of the
original, which is, "Shepherd thou,"
or, "Shepherdize thou my sheep?"
Your translation runs, "Feed my
sheep," as if there were no differ-
ence between *βοσκειν*, to feed, and
ποιμαίνειν, to shepherdize. A man
may feed a flock without being its
shepherd; and, Christ having used
two words of such different import,
not to have noticed such difference
in the English version, constitutes
one small particle of that vast mass

* John xx. 23.

* John xx. 23.

of criminality which I attribute to the translators of the *parliamentary*, *oracular* Bible.

But now to another point. My friend has read to you a passage from the great St. Augustine, with a view of proving that that illustrious father of the Church differed from us Catholics as to the investiture of supreme headship in the apostle Peter. My learned antagonist only indulged you with a few sweet and balmy lines from St. Augustine, such as suited his purpose; that is, to conceal from you St. Augustine's real opinion as to the supremacy of St. Peter. It now, therefore, becomes my business to set this matter at rest by the mouth of St. Augustine himself. Listen!

"But if we are to consider the series of episcopal successions, with how much greater certainty we number from Peter, to whom, as representing the whole Church, Christ said—*On this rock I will build my Church.* To Peter succeeded Linus," &c. t. ii. p. 120.

Again—"For who can be ignorant that the most blessed Peter is the first of the apostles?"—*Tract* 56, in *Evang. Joan.* pars 2. t. iii. p. 656.

Again—"The apostle Peter, on account of the *primacy of his apostleship*, represented the Church. As to himself, by nature he was but one man, by grace a Christian, but by a more abundant grace the first apostle."—*Ib. Tract* cxxiv. p. 822.

But listen, my friends, most attentively to the following passage from St. Augustine, which you could scarcely expect my learned antagonist, however enthusiastic his love for that holy father, to lay before you:—

"In the Catholic Church, many are the considerations which keep me in her bosom. The assent of

nations; her authority first established by miracles; the succession of pastors *from the chair of Peter*, to whom *the Lord committed the care of feeding his flock*, down to the present bishop; lastly, the name itself of *Catholic*."—Edit. Bened. *Contra ep. Fundam.* c. iv. t. viii. p. 153.

And mark, my friends, this is precisely the doctrine of all the fathers, who, as my witty friend so ingeniously remarks, are ever knocking their heads against one another. I have not time to cite them in succession. Take, however, one as a specimen of this their mutual concussion of heads one against the other. [Laughter.]

St. John Chrysostom says—"For what reason did Christ shed his blood? Certainly, *to gain those sheep, the care of which he committed to Peter* and his successors."—*De Sacerd.* lib. ii. c. i. t. i. p. 372. Edit. Montfaucon. Paris, 1718-34.

Now, you must observe that these two head-knockers flourished about the same period of time, viz. St. Augustine, 391; St. Chrysostom, 397.

You have, then, I say, all the fathers of the Church agreeing together, that St. Peter was the chosen, the grand shepherd—the ruler of the Church; and we have the names of every ruler in succession, from that day to this. And if my learned friend is fighting the battles of the Church of England, I would give him a piece of salutary advice: If he attempts to shake one of our succession, he shakes the validity of holy orders in the Church of England, for they pique themselves on having been originally ordained from us. "Feed my sheep," said Christ, when leaving his disciples. The sheep were to be fed by a lawful successor of Peter to the end of time. So says Augustine, and Basil, and all the fathers

of the Church, from whom my friend gave you such sweet garbled extracts. [Laughter.] They all agreed together, that where that Church is, there alone are the pure, the limpid waters of salvation. Every other Church, depend upon it, however soft the stream, however smooth the form under which it passes, is of a troubled nature—is but the influx of corruption, whereof he who drinks will inevitably perish. I am as ardent for your salvation, my friends, as my antagonist professes to be for mine. I pant as ardently to bring you within the portals of the Catholic Church, whose priests are waiting for you, having already received many since the beginning of this Discussion. They have had more than *one* application, and I should like to know from my reverend friend what effect he has made on the heart of any Catholic in this room. I say, then, my friends, that wherever that Church is to be found, there, under its hallowed umbrage, you will be enabled to repose in full security and peace; there you will be enabled to lift up your hearts in gratitude to heaven, and to exclaim in unison with the one fold and the one Shepherd, that, with one mind, with one heart, “ye glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” There, in one word, my friends, will you find all that is calculated to give rest, and stability, and comfort to your souls, now tossed about by every wind of doctrine; and to settle the grand interests of an eternity upon a solid, fixed, and immovable basis. [Sensation.] “One fold, one Shepherd,” says sacred writ. Millions, ay, hundreds of millions of Catholics spread over the surface of this globe on which we live—all with one voice and with one mouth, and under one head, adoring and glorifying God—give me a most lively

idea, when I exert the eye of my intellect with which Providence has endowed me, of that *one* fold and *one* Shepherd, pointed out to me in the pages of holy writ. On the other hand, a few millions of Protestants, comparatively speaking, and these millions split into divers opinions concerning the most important, the most vital dogmas of religion, but all of them agreeing to protest (some even denying the divinity of Christ) against us—all agreeing in protesting against the Catholic Church, in which alone is to be found the most perfect concord and unanimity—give me an equally lively idea of those schismatic churches pointed out so prophetically by the apostle Paul, when he says, Romans xvi. 17, 18: “Now, I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they are such as serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good works and *fair speeches* deceive the hearts of the simple.”

Truly then, my Protestant brethren, (without meaning any offence to you,) to enter into your Church, what is it but, in the language of St. Paul, to enter into fields of “doubtful disputation?” May it not be said of teachers like these who preside in your Church, in which there are so many jarring elements of discord, that they are strangers to the way of peace; in one word, that they are strangers to the form of doctrine once delivered to the saints? And if so, is it not time, let me ask you, in all seriousness, to devote a few moments of salutary reflection and meditation to the grand all-absorbing subject, namely, whether, knowing as ye do the appalling text of St. Peter, that even Scripture may, by private

interpretation, be wrested *by the unstable and the unlearned to their own damnation*, ye can be rationally confident in chalking out a way of security for yourselves? Is it not, I say, time to meditate profoundly, in your ealm hours of recess from your families and from the business which occupies you, on this grand question, Whether, in chalking out a way for yourselves which may conduct you to heaven, ye may not have selected a path by which you have miserably wandered into the broad road which conducteth to the regions of everlasting misery. If, my friends, you would but open the pages of the fathers of the Church, and see their unanimity, in flat contradiction to my learned friend, who declares they are all discord and confusion—if you would only open them and see the unanimity that prevails upon important subjects; the supremacy and primacy of Peter; the necessity of clinging to the chair of Peter; the impossibility of serving God in a church disconnected with the chair of Peter—if you could but be made acquainted, in the short compass of time that remains to me, with that which all the fathers of the Church have written concerning this said chair—all vying with one another in bestowing epithets of commendation on it—you would cease to listen to a preacher in the nineteenth century who scorns all that was sacred and revered in the days of old, and glories in blaspheming it. Now listen to St. Jerome:—

“Dedi conscriptam fidem,” says the venerable father, “qui sic non credit alienus à Christo est:” “I have committed the faith to writing; who is not of this faith is an enemy to Christ.”

Well! and I have said before, almost *totidem verbis*, I repeat again, How am I to ascertain the faith

of which this father of the Church was both a member and so bright an ornament? Can I flatter myself, from any expressions in his work that are not vague and undefined, that the faith which I follow in the nineteenth century bears any resemblance to that which was illustrated by the life and writings of a St. Jerome in the fourth? In answer to this question, my Protestant friends, I can only say, that one thing at least must remain uncontested by you, and that is, that in endeavouring to find out this faith, *which he who follows not is an enemy to Christ, alienus à Christo est*, I turn my eyes, in the nineteenth century, precisely whither St. Jerome directed his in the fourth, namely, to the chair of Peter. Listen to the proof; hear his voice! “Ego interim, clamito, Si quis cathedræ Petri jungitur meus est.” “I, in the mean time, do not cease to cry out, *He who is joined to the chair of Peter is of the same faith with me.*”

Yes, I also cry out in the nineteenth century, whilst I look to the chair of Peter, Every one who is united to this chair is a Catholic; he who is not, however he may pretend to be an adherent to primitive Christianity, is the asserter of a faith disowned by St. Jerome, and, to use his own expression, “*Alienus à Christo est:*” “*He is estranged from Christ.*”

But hear, again, the same saint; he is writing to Pope Damasus, who then sat upon the chair of Peter, which is now filled by his Holiness Pope Gregory the Sixteenth. “Non novi Vitalem, Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum. Quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit; hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est:” “*I know not Vitalis, I spurn away Meletius, I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whosoever doth not gather together*

in conjunction with thee, scattereth abroad ; that is, whosoever is not of Christ, belongeth to Antichrist."

Precisely so, my friends, *mutatis mutandis*—changing merely the names, say those who cling to the chair of Peter at the present day. "I know not Luther, I spurn away Calvin, I am ignorant of Melancthon. Whosoever doth not, in conjunction with thee, O holy father, that now fillest the chair of Peter, gather together, scattereth abroad. Whosoever is not of Christ belongeth to antichrist." No clouds of heresy, however distant the land I live in, shall ever obscure this chair of Peter from my sight. No edicts of kings or queens, no acts of parliament, shall ever intimidate or prevent me from crying out aloud that I recognise him who fills it as the head of the one, only, true, unerring Church. "*Aliæ sunt leges Cæsarum, aliæ Jesu Christi,*" says St. Jerome ; that is, "*The edicts of a monarch are one thing, and the laws of Jesus Christ are another.*"

Open then, I beseech you, my Protestant friends, open at length your eyes, I beseech you—behold and recognise with Jerome and all the fathers of the Church the chair of Peter—that centre of unity that has ever stood unshaken amidst all the storms of heresy and all the vicissitudes of time!

Now, my friends, as to persecution, we know that there have been great atrocities committed by both Catholics and Protestants at the heads of governments. But what does that signify? Every sensible Catholic deprecates these crimes; every sensible man in every age has raised his voice against the political persecution of heretics; and persecution never was an article of our Church. When our priests had their bowels torn out in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it never was an

article of the Protestant faith thus to torture. As to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, so often alluded to by our adversary, nothing ever excited my horror more than the description of that infernal tragedy, either in prose or verse, when I first read it. Indeed I remember (and it is now thirty years ago) I translated into English the description given of it by Voltaire in his *Henriade*. He there makes Henry IV. come into England, and describes the massacre to Queen Elizabeth in the following lines:—

The source, fair queen, where all our ills
are found,
With baleful fury flows from sacred ground.
It is religion, whose inhuman zeal
Has roused all France to wave the murderous steel.

'Tis not for me the empire to assume
Between the sons of Calvin and of Rome;
These eyes have witnessed one continued
tide

Of crimes and horrors flow on either side;
And if from error perfidy proceeds—
If, in the struggle with which Europe bleeds,
Murder and treason be th' unfailling test
To mark the cause where error stands confessed—

In crime, as error, neither side will yield,
But still maintain a well-contended field.
For me, I fight, but for my country's laws:
Is God incensed?—to God belongs the cause.
It fits not me to execute his ire,
Or burn his incense with unhallowed fire;
And curs'd be he, from whom the art began
To grasp dominion o'er the mind of man;
In nature's spite to shackle and control
The thoughts that triumph in the free-born
soul;

Who issue, sword in hand, to pave the way
For their religion's arbitrary sway,
And deem a God the fountain of all good—
A God of peace—delights in human blood;
That his pure eye looks down upon the feast,
And views with joy the homicidal priest!

Thus you see that, according to Voltaire (and mark, my friends, his poetry agrees in the fact with all the sober-writing prose historians of the day), neither of them, according to well authenticated history, could obtain the palm in atrocious deeds.

"Couriers were despatched," says the note on the second book of the

Henriade, "to the different towns and provinces to order the massacre. It was disobeyed in many places *by priests, and bishops, and laymen*. One bishop made this memorable answer, when the order was brought to him, '*That he did not believe it came from the king; but, if it did, he respected his majesty too much to put it into execution.*'" Now hear the illustrious Bossuet:—

"Beza's history will show that our reformed were always ready at the least signal to fly to arms, to break open prisons, to seize on churches; nor was anything ever seen more factious. Who is ignorant of the cruelties exercised by the queen of Navarre against priests and *religieux*? The towers from which the Catholics were cast headlong, and the deep pits they were flung into, are shown to this day. The well of the bishop's palace at Nismes, and the cruel instruments employed to force them to the Protestant sermons, are not less known to the whole world. We have still the informations and decrees, by which it appears that these bloody executions were the *deliberate resolves of Protestants* in council assembled. We have the original orders of generals, and those of cities, at the request of consistories, to compel the *papists* to embrace the Reformation by taxes, by quartering soldiers upon them, by demolishing their houses and uncovering the roofs. Those who withdrew to escape these violences were stripped of their goods. The records of the town-houses of Nismes, Montauban, Alais, Montpellier, and other cities of the party, are full of such decrees; nor should I mention them, but for the complaints with which our fugitives alarm all Europe."—Bossuet, *History of the Variations*, vol. ii. p. 42.

Again, in page 44 of the same volume, Bossuet thus writes:—

"The assassination of Francis, duke of Guise, ought not to pass unmentioned in this history, forasmuch as the author of this murder (a Protestant) mingled religion with his crime. It is Beza himself who represents to us the murderer in question, *Polttrot, as excited by some secret impulse*, at the time he resolved upon the infamous exploit; and, in order to make us understand that this *secret impulse* was from God, he also describes the same *Polttrot*, as he was just upon the point of entering upon the execution of this black design, praying to God most ardently that he would vouchsafe to change his will if what he intended was displeasing to him; otherwise, that he would give him constancy and strength sufficient to slay this tyrant, and by that means rescue Orleans from destruction, and the whole kingdom from so miserable a tyranny. Thereupon, on the evening of the same day," proceeds Beza, "he struck the stroke; that is, during his enthusiasm, and just rising up from ardent prayer." But mark, my friends, the concluding sentence of this extract: it runs thus:—"So soon as our reformed knew that the thing was done, they solemnly returned thanks to God with great rejoicings."

Again—Voltaire writes thus, in his book called "A Sketch of the History of France towards the end of the Sixteenth Century, under Francis II. to the death of Henry IV." page 275.

"The court gave orders for the same massacre in all those provinces, as St. Herem, in Auvergne: La Guiche, at Maçon, the viscount of Orme at Bayonne, and several others refused to obey, and wrote to Charles IX., nearly in these terms—'*That they would DIE FOR HIS SER-*

VICE, *but would not consent to murder any one for him.*"

Thus you see, my friends, that there were in those days genuine Catholics to be found, who abhorred the massacre of St. Bartholomew as much as we do at the present day, and who, in opposition to a torrent of iniquity, had the daring to remain inflexibly, unalterably true to Christian principle and the voice of humanity!

But I resume a subject of more importance. My friend will have it that the baptism of infants is to be found in Scripture; he has settled it; he fancies that he has produced a text which is to confound you all. Now he could not answer that until he had purloined his instructions from Catholic divines. Yesterday he was quite at a nonplus, and I never blushed for a man more in my life. [Tittering.] Now I come to the Catholic divines. Every school-boy in this room, learning his catechism, knows that these notes mean to say that we do not in our traditions go contrary to Scripture. There is nothing in Scripture that is at open war with our doctrines. But every Catholic knows that Scripture self-explaining is not sufficient. The Catholic requires the voice of the great instructress of ages to tell him what the meaning of it is; and when my learned friend says that everything necessary to faith and morals is to be found in Scripture, I say so also: I am satisfied with that. And why? Because I find in Scripture that the priests are to be its interpreters—"the priests' lips are to keep knowledge." No Scripture is of private *disentanglement*. And now what says Jeremy Taylor on infant baptism?

Page 55. "And however the matter be for godfathers, yet the tradition of baptizing infants passed through the hands of Irenæus."

(Lib. ii. 39.) "Christ did sanctify every age by his own susception of it and similitude to it; for he came to save all men by himself; I say all, who by him are born again to God; *infants and children and boys and young men and old men*. He was made an infant to infants, a little one to the little ones," &c. "Christus infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes." And Origen is express: "Ecclesia traditionem ab apostolis suscepit etiam parvulis dare baptismum." "The Church hath received a tradition from the apostles to give baptism to children."

Page 35. "Upon the supposition of these grounds, the baptism of infants, according to the perpetual practice of the Church of God, will stand firm and unshaken upon its own base."—Discourse of Baptism, &c.: together with a Consideration of the Practice of the Church in *Baptizing Infants, and the Practice justified*. By Jeremy Taylor, D.D. 4to. London, 1652.

"That the Church of God, ever since her numbers are full, has for very many ages consisted almost wholly of assemblies of men who have been baptized in their infancy; and although, in the first callings of the Gentiles, the chiefest and the most frequent baptisms were of converted and repenting persons and believers, yet, *from the beginning also the Church hath baptized the infants of Christian parents*, according to the prophecy of Isaiah xlix. 22:—"Behold, I will lift up my hands to the Gentiles and set up a standard to the people, and they shall bring their sons in their arms, and thy daughters will be carried upon their shoulders.""

Now, what I ask of my learned antagonist is, Do the Anabaptists believe this doctrine of Jeremy Taylor, who delivers the doctrine of

the Church of England, to be sound Christianity? If not, can my friend look me in the face and dare to repeat his assertion once more, that Protestant sects differ from one another but in non-essentials? The Lutherans, says Bossuet, upon seeing these errors sprout up among the *Anabaptist sects*, condemned them by three articles of the *Confession of Augsburg*, the first of which runs thus:—

“That baptism is necessary to salvation; and that they condemn the Anabaptists, who assert, that children may be saved without baptism, and out of the Church of Jesus Christ.” — *Bossuet, History of the Variations*, vol. i. p. 123.

What becomes, I ask, then, my Anabaptist friends, according to the Church of England—in the supposition that Jeremy Taylor, one of its orthodox bishops, delivers it truly—what becomes of your innumerable little children that die without baptism? [Sensation.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—The reference?

Mr. FRENCH—[smiling.]—Yes! but my time is flying. I will give it you after I have finished.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Very well; after—that will do.

JOHN KENDAL, Esq. here gave the reference alluded to.

Mr. FRENCH continued.—Thus you see, my Anabaptist friends who are here present, that these Church-of-England-men, in order to confute us Catholics, take up the Bible and proscribe tradition; but in order to confute you, they throw away the Bible and take up tradition as the standard of their faith, the confounder of their enemies. You cannot, then, but see most clearly, my Protestant friends, ye harmonious creatures of the Reformation, how perpetually and how vitally ye are at war with each other!

But what an acute lynx-eye must my friend have to see baptism so legibly in the Bible! [A laugh.] Now what says my Bible-pinioned opponent—my friend who has a text for every thing? I call for a text, and he gives me a text which will not satisfy any rational creature in this room. I certainly, for my own part, should call my reverend friend *hodierni temporis fidelissimus testis*. [Laughter.] And now, gentlemen, I throw down my Rule of Faith on the table, which is TRADITION—the Bible and the traditions of the Church. [The learned gentleman here deposited on the platform table his MS. notes and memoranda, which created a little amusement, and continued.] I throw down this; my friend can look at it. Here it is on paper, and now it is down as much as his print [laughter]; that paper of mine is just as able to speak as is that Bible of my learned friend on the table of itself; and that table is just as able to tell me who glued it together, as that Bible is to tell me whether those who wrote it were inspired. My Rule of Faith is tradition—traditions handed down with the Bible; which traditions were handed down to me at the same time by the keepers of the Bible, the lawful guardians of the Bible—the priests of the Church; they are its lawful interpreters. Divine revelation is the Rule of Faith, comprehended not only in Scripture, but also in tradition, by which—and mark ye, my friends, what I say—by which tradition even the Scripture is made known to us. They satisfied me of this, and that is the way I come to know the Bible. I saw a Church professing holiness, apostolicity, unity, CATHOLICITY, and I examined every feature of it, and I saw that in every age it had laid an indisputable claim to holiness, and truth,

and integrity; I saw apostolicity stamped indelibly on its brow; I saw universality, that it was the converter of all nations; I saw unity—Catholics of all lands and all countries; all concurring, all agreeing in fundamental truth, notwithstanding the assertion of my learned friend that they do not—agreeing, every part of the world to which you may be wafted at the present moment, in performing the Sacrifice of the Mass, in offering prayers, and all other fundamental dogmas; all adoring *one* God, under *one* head, with *one* mind and *one* mouth. You have no such unity among you; ye, O Protestants, are a house of discord and indescribable confusion. Yes, gentlemen, there is nothing but war in your camp; and, as my learned friend has treated me with the recital of half a dozen verses from the “*Ars Poetica*” of Horace, I will repay him by the recital of a few from Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, in order to paint these your warring camps in their genuine colours. We will change, of course, the word *Æmathios* into *Æolios*, &c. as being more apposite to the plains of Exeter Hall:—

*Bella per Æolios plus quàm civilia campos,
Jusque datum sceleris canimus, populumque
nocentem*

*In sua devicta conversum viscera dextrâ;
Cognatasque acies et rupto fœdere regni,
Certatum totis concussi viribus orbis.
In commune nefas, infestisque obvia signis
Signa, pares aquilas et pila minantia pitis.*

And let my learned friend remark especially the unseasonable moment of *these fraternal discords*, for they are carried on precisely at a time, when (for you know, my friends, my Calvinistic opponent ever politely designates our Church by *the Lady of Babylon*)

*Cumque superba foret Babylon spolianda
trophæis, &c.—LUCAN.*

That is, the various sects of Protestantism, instead of joining toge-

ther in one solid phalanx, to strip, if possible, our towering Church of its trophies, are ever at deadly war with themselves and anathematizing one another, so that, whensoever any one of them takes the field against us Catholics, it uniformly happens, in the language of the same poet—

Bella geri placuit nullos habitura triumphos.
They wage vain war, and reap eternal shame.

Yes, my friends, antiquity is the badge of the Catholic faith, and vain and impotent is every attempt of Protestantism to tear it from us.

It is observed by St. Augustine (*Lib. de Vera Religione*) as well as by other holy fathers, that the apostles, in order to enable mankind in all ages to discern the Catholic Church, invented the name Catholic, and set it down in their common creed, in that clause or article which runs, “I believe the holy Catholic Church,” by which word Catholic, which signifies universal, they gave all posterity to understand, that what doctrines or opinions soever should afterwards arise among Christians, dissenting from the *general* consent and *traditions* of the *whole* Church, was to be reputed as erroneous and heretical, and to be utterly rejected; and that the only anchor, stay, or security for a Christian mind in matters of faith was to be a *Catholic*; that is, as the ancient fathers interpret it, one who, laying aside all particular opinions and imaginations, both of himself and others, doth subject his opinion and judgment to the determination of Christ’s universal, visible, and known Church upon earth, embracing whatsoever she believes, and abandoning whatsoever she rejects. And this is that plain, direct, sure, and infallible way mentioned by Isaiah xxxv. 8:—“And a highway

shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness: the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those, the way-faring men, though fools, *shall not err therein.*"

It is thus I verify the words of St. Paul, which I have quoted to you before, and which point out so prophetically the jarring churches of Protestantism.

[The learned gentleman's hour here closed.]

JOHN KENDAL, Esq. rose to dissolve the meeting, which separated in the most peaceable and orderly manner.

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given.

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,
Reporter.

ELEVENTH EVENING, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1839.

SUBJECT:

RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued.)

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I feel exceedingly sorry that Mr. French has found, or professed to find, so many causes of complaint in the course of this discussion. It seems the audience is not the only party with whom he finds fault, but he has also found fault with another individual in this assembly, whom I shall not name, on account of the laws prescribed at the commencement of this discussion. All that I can say is, that I knew not that any portion of the Protestant audience designed or meant to retire at the close of my second speech, or before they had the satisfaction and enjoyment of hearing Mr. French's last. I deeply regret their patience failed them, as my antagonist's speech gives generally fresh force and illustration to the claims and majesty of Scripture truth. I know nothing about such a resolution, and if they did it, they did it on their own responsibility, without any preconceived arrangement, and without our being privy to such an intention in any shape. But now, if I had been searching for grounds of complaint, I might have complained that too many Roman Catholics did not think fit to appear when I began the meeting, until Mr. French's speech began. If I were searching for cause of complaint, I should have abundant ground for it. Not a few of the Roman Catholic part of the audience do not make their appearance when I have the first speech until Mr. French begins his speech—that is to say, at least an hour after the time appointed for the meeting. So that there might be complaints on both sides; but it really argues something like a consciousness of deficiency of cause to have recourse to such paltry charges against any portion of this audience. I, for my part, wish to make no complaints. I would say—"Do as you like—strike me, but hear me," as it was replied by a general of old; "Do with me as you like, only give me a hearing."

Were I to follow the rambling remarks of my antagonist in his last speech, which some of you Protestants, it appears, have had the bitter misfortune not to have heard—[tittering]—I should then have to re-enter on the discussion of all the dogmas, peculiarities, and points of the Roman Catholic Faith. I should have to discuss again Transubstantiation, which I had thought was exterminated for ever. I should have to discuss the Mass and the Confessional, and many and any other points besides, and beyond the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, into all of which my antagonist was anxious to drag me, in the hope that he might spare the Roman Catholics in this audience the pain of hearing a plain exposition of the inconsistencies, contradictions, and fallacies of his and their Rule of Faith. I shall not imitate Mr. French's example. It may be sufficient to observe, that when I quoted a passage from Augustine, in order to show the contrarities of the fathers upon a leading tenet of your Rule of Faith, that passage was decidedly against the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and when Mr. French professed to find a passage from a father in favour of it—which I do not grant, as I shall show you then and thereby he did just as I desired—he contributed the more effectually to promote my end, which is to show that the brightest of human authorities as a Rule of Faith are contradictory and inconsistent. But in order to show you that St. Augustine does not at all admit of my opponent's new light, when the construction of the passage is fairly and honestly weighed, I read from him a passage in the third book on "Christian Doctrine," vol. iii. page 52. Benedictine Edition, Paris, A.D. 1685. Now Mr. French says, all that St.

Augustine meant to convey was the eating of the flesh and blood under the "species" of bread and wine—a sort of metaphysical mystery, that this was all that by "a figure" he meant to convey; but St. Augustine himself says, unless my senses, like Mr. French's, are deceived:—

"Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis et sanguinem ejus biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus videtur aut flagitium jubere. FIGURA ERGO EST præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum et salviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata."—*De Doc. Christ.* lib. iii. tom. iii. p. 52.

This is the language of Augustine: the figure is not in the *manducation* of the sacrament, but, says Augustine, in the sacrament itself. In other words, he says it is the symbol, and not the thing signified. If I were to use the ipsissima verba of Augustine as my own, we should hear my opponent's usual homily upon orientalisms. Augustine never heard of Transubstantiation, and the very idea of this monstrosity he detested. I should like to call the attention of this audience to some references which I made to the Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Peter. When my learned antagonist brought forward these forgeries, as they are and have been proved to be to a very great extent, he said he would not take the authority of the distinguished Roman Catholic historian Dupin, and Dupin was thus cast overboard in the same gallant way in which he had served the other great doctors of his Church. Let me, however, inform my opponent, that Tillmont, another Roman Catholic historian, records the same verdict as Dupin, on the forged liturgies. You will

find valuable light on this subject in his vol. i. p. 422.

On the true character of Dupin, I quote the following testimony. It will be seen by the following explanation, that Dupin was too honest and too upright to serve the Papacy at the expense of truth. Some private doctors condemned Dupin, for reasons most honourable to the historian, but the Pope and Council, *i.e.* the Church, never condemned him.

Biographical Dictionary, revised and enlarged, by Alexander Chalmers, F.S.A.

"DUPIN.—Having made choice of the Church as a profession, he went through the usual course of studies at the Sorbonne, and employed much of his time in perusing the fathers and ecclesiastical historians, but had no other view in this than to gratify his curiosity, while preparing himself for his licentiate-ship in divinity, which he was then too young to obtain. In 1680, he took the degree of bachelor of divinity; and in July, 1684, that of doctor. He soon after undertook to publish the work which has made him most known, his 'Universal Library of Ecclesiastical Writers,' containing their lives, and a catalogue, critical account, and analysis of their works: a design of vast extent, which might have done credit to the labours of a society, yet was *successfully* accomplished by an individual, who was not only interrupted by professional duties, but wrote and published a great many other works. The first volume of his 'Bibliothèque' was printed at Paris, 1686, 8vo; and the others in succession, as far as five volumes, which contained an account of the first eight centuries. The freedom, however, which he had used in criticising the style, character, and doctrines of

some of the celebrated ecclesiastical writers, roused the prejudices of the celebrated Bossuet, who exhibited a complaint against Dupin to Harlay, Archbishop of Paris. The Archbishop accordingly, in 1693, published a decree against the work, yet with more deliberation than might have been expected. His Grace first ordered the work to be read by four doctors of divinity of the faculty of Paris, who perused it separately, and then combining their remarks, drew up a report, which they presented to the Archbishop, who, in his decree, says, that he also examined the work, and found that it would be very prejudicial to the Church if it were suffered to be dispersed. Dupin was then summoned before the Archbishop and the doctors, and, after several meetings, gave in a paper in which he delivered his opinion on the objections made to his book, in such a manner as to satisfy them that, however liberal his expressions, *he was himself sound*; but the work itself they nevertheless thought must be condemned, 'as containing several propositions that are false, rash, and scandalous, capable of offending pious ears, tending to *weaken the arguments which are brought from tradition to prove the authority of the canonical books of Holy Scripture, and of several other articles of faith*; injurious to general councils, TO THE HOLY APOSTOLICAL SEE, and to the fathers of the Church; erroneous and leading to heresy.' This sentence upon the work, however, will prove its highest recommendation to the Protestant reader, who will probably, as he may very justly, infer, that it means *no more than that Dupin was too impartial and candid for his judges.*"

Now, as to the subject of marriage, which has been alluded to,

I beg leave to state, that St. Jerome does not appear to have entertained any of the notions respecting it which are held by the modern Roman Catholic Church.

The extract from St. Jerome is as follows :—

“If the name of bishops may be given to such as will ordain no deacons except they are married.”

This extract occurs in St. Jerome's fifty-third letter, directed to Riparius, a presbyter in Spain, who wished to know Jerome's opinion of a work of Vigilantius.

So that, it seems, there were some bishops in his Church who held that a minister ought to be married, whilst Mr. French says, that bishops now hold they ought not to be married. Thus we have another proof of the unchanging unanimity which exists in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church ! My opponent next tried to vindicate his beloved Bossuet, on whom I had fastened the powerful charge of entertaining persecution and intolerant sentiments. He *tried* to do so by mystifying, and by mis-stating the facts of the case. I did not say that Bossuet prompted the revocation of the edict of Nantz ; I did not say that he had any personal share or communication in the revocation of that edict, but that *subsequently, in the face of all France*, he pronounced a glowing eulogium on the Chancellor of the King of France, and commended, amid the plaudits of the French clergy, the conduct of Louis XIV. for having exterminated the heretics of that day.

This oration was delivered in the face of all France, and before the clergy of France. It was never protested against by the clergy of France. It is contained in the authenticated edition of the works of Bossuet, and, as far as any document can be authentic and binding,

that document is so. Therefore it must appear to every honest and dispassionate auditor that Bossuet, whom Romanists look up to, approves of the extermination of heretics. But I can imagine that some Roman Catholics will ask, Is this sanguinary taste for blood consonant with the soft and dulcet strains in which he tries to win Protestants over to the Roman Catholic Church in his celebrated work, generally recommended to us heretics ? As to the consistency of it, it is not my business to explain it : all that I assert is, that when he was addressing the Roman Catholic Church, unfettered, unimpeded, and unshackled, he approved of the extermination of heretics ; but when he addresses a Protestant, he softens down all the asperities of his Church, makes her to put her best foot forward, until you are brought within the range of her dominion and her influence. Then if Mr. French does not mind much about Bossuet, or about his entertaining persecuting principles, what does he say to the 600 fathers of the Council of Chalcedon having approved and lauded the extermination of heretics ? What does he say to a *general council* approving of the extermination of heretics ? And, therefore, I must again inform this audience, that Mr. French is bound either to hold that it is right in the Roman Catholic Church to exterminate us heretics by fire or faggot, or he must clearly *cast the 600 fathers of the Council of Chalcedon overboard*, with Bossuet after them. [Laughter.]

Mr. French next gratified this audience with an *excursus* upon penance, confession, and contrition, and as to the mode in which he makes his confession when he goes to the priest to obtain absolution. Now I have an interesting fact to

state to you on this subject. He showed you how much of a deep and penitential feeling must be entertained by the penitent before he goes to the priest to obtain *judicial* absolution. What will you say, when I tell you that the Pope and many doctors in his own Church, who also say, moreover, that the sentiment is not proscribed by the Council of Trent, do hold, and have held, that *attrition*, or the fear of fire in hell, is all that is wanted to carry you to heaven.

MR. FRENCH.—Oh, oh!

REV. J. CUMMING—[in continuation].—If you doubt it, I will read the document. Pope Benedict XIV. *Diae.* book vii. c. 13, records the following words:—

“First of all, Francis Victoria and Dominic Soto, both of the order of Dominicans, have taught, that to obtain remission of sins by the power of the keys, *servile attrition*, or a feeling that has in it the fear of hell only, is enough, provided the penitent think it true contrition.”

[MR. FRENCH again ejaculated.]

REV. J. CUMMING.—Oh, but stop and hear the remainder. The Pope goes on to say, “Melchior Canus following Victoria and Soto, holds that *SERVILE ATTRITION, KNOWN TO BE SUCH BY THE PENITENT, IS ENOUGH.*”

MR. FRENCH.—With confession.

REV. J. CUMMING.—With confession! You see Mr. French admits that confession is all that needs to be added to make the fear of hell a right qualification for heaven.

MR. FRENCH.—To be sure!

REV. J. CUMMING—[in continuation].—“This opinion of Melchior Canus was so approved,” continues the Pope, “that it found many distinguished patrons, such as Francis Saurez, Gabriel Vasquez, and countless other theologians. The more learned and wary subscribed to this opinion with great caution, but

latter doctors, emboldened by the numbers that agreed with them, not only have asserted it without any doubt or hesitation, but have not hesitated to brand the other opinion as altogether improbable, dangerous, and virtually proscribed by the Council of Trent.”

Now you observe the Pope says, with countless theologians, what implies that a man may pave his way to glory upon the ruins of the first great commandment, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength;” so that, according to the theology of Rome, it is perfectly possible to reach the gates of beatitude and glory without having in the heart one particle of love for God.

Benedict XIV. records this horrible notion, and finds countless theologians to support it; and, therefore, Mr. French must either subscribe to these sentiments—which I dare say he does not—

MR. FRENCH—[interrupting].—I do!

REV. J. CUMMING.—You do?

MR. FRENCH.—Yes, decidedly.

REV. J. CUMMING—[turning to the audience].—There is unanimity for once, but the matter of that unanimity will give you a dreadful picture of Romanism.

MR. FRENCH.—The beginning of wisdom—the fear of God.

REV. J. CUMMING.—But what I quote is THE FEAR OF HELL.

MR. FRENCH.—I beg your pardon, it is the fear of God.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I repeat the words of the Pope, “servile attrition, or a feeling that has in it the fear of hell only.”

MR. FRENCH.—The fear of hell means the fear of God.

REV. J. CUMMING.—After this explanation my comments are needless. [Laughter and confusion.]

GEORGE FINCH, Esq. P.C. rose to order.

Rev. J. CUMMING [in continuation.]—I hope the reporter has taken that down [addressing him.] Mr. French states that the fear of hell is the same, or is equivalent to, the fear of God.

The next reference of my antagonist was a remark condemnatory of a State Church or an established Church. I shall, however, not now enter upon that controversy. I only add, that I hold in my hand a letter addressed by his Holiness, the present Pope Gregory XVI., to all the patriarchs, prelates, primates, archbishops and bishops, and approved by the Roman Catholic Bishop of London, taken from the "Laity's Directory," for 1833. I have my own opinions upon the subject, and I do not fear to express them on just occasions. Now you have heard what Mr. French has stated and denounced; you shall now hear what his own Pope says and recommends. The words are as follow:

"Nor can we argue more consoling consequences to religion and to governments from the zeal of some to separate the Church from the state, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the empire; for it is clear this union is dreaded by the profane lovers of liberty only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both."

Either Mr. French differs from his Pope, and must be one of "the profane lovers of liberty," or he holds in heart what he has with the lip condemned.

This encyclical letter is from the "Laity's Directory" for 1833, and is addressed by the Pope to the laity, primates, archbishops, and bishops; and in it Pope Gregory XVI. holds the propriety, beauty, and importance of an union between Church and State; and here is Mr.

French, supported by five or six priests, denouncing it. So much for the unanimity of the Church of Rome! Now I presume Mr. French must either stand before this audience and say, "I hold the union of Church and State to be right," or he must denounce both it and the Pope, as well as the bishops, archbishops, and primates, all in a lump. Mr. French, you will recollect, cast St. Augustine overboard; next Aquinas, next Delahogue, next Bellarmine, next the Bolandists, with their eighty-four folio volumes; next he cast Dupin overboard, next Bossuet, then he cast the Rhemish translators of the Bible overboard, and says he could make a better. Next he cast overboard the notes of his own Bible, declaring them to be no part of his Rule of Faith; and at length he cast his own present living Pope overboard, with a whole batch of prelates, and primates, and bishops; resembling the huge Leviathan in the ocean, every stroke that he gives each pope and prelate that opposes him, with his logic fin sends them straightway to the bottom of the sea. One and all disappear in a twinkling before this giant of the nineteenth century. [Laughter.] The plain fact is, that Mr. French has gone on in so cavalier and contemptuous a style towards fathers and popes and councils, that at length he has exterminated his own Rule of Faith merely by my furnishing him now and then with a hammer; and without in the least touching mine, which is the Bible, and the Bible *alone*. It remains in all its integrity the religion of Protestants. But as to his own Rule of Faith, if I had wished any man to come forward and give it the most thorough exposure with which it was ever visited, I should have called in Mr. French to do so. He

has given up point after point, part after part, one after another, until at last he has arrived at the very climax of *unity* by standing *alone*. [Laughter.] In fact, my learned antagonist has fallen upon popes, archbishops, primates, seraphic doctors, cardinals, historians, divines, and fathers, with the most wonderful force, like Samson among the Philistines, and has smitten them hip and thigh by thousands, till they lie a heap of tremendous carnage at his magnanimous feet. Sure am I that the firebrands between the foxes' tails, which Samson sent among the corn fields of the Philistines, were nothing when compared with the havoc which he has so mercilessly dealt amongst seraphic doctors, and popes, and cardinals, and bishops. I would, therefore, submit to this audience the propriety henceforth of constituting my learned antagonist generalissimo of the Protestant forces. [Laughter.] He now literally stands with his Rule of Faith exterminated and in ruins around him, and is left all alone in his glory.

Mr. French has endeavoured to show you, for the hundredth time, that differences exist among Protestants. He hath shown you some extracts of a rather questionable kind from some odd Protestant writers holding this and that opinion. Whatever differences or diversities he professes to show among Protestants, does not, you will bear in mind, in reality touch our Rule of Faith; but every diversity of sentiment which I show amongst Roman Catholic doctors, and fathers, and divines, strikes to the very vitals of his Rule of Faith. In the next place the differences among Protestants consist chiefly in circumstantial or non-essentials, but the differences

among Roman Catholics reach to the very core, demonstrating the whole system as corrupt and rotten at the heart. Our Church differences are but insignificant and paltry, whereas those in the Roman Catholic Church are of the most vital and awful description. Now I hold in my hand a pamphlet of my own, which I alluded to—namely, the “Unity of Protestants,” which will show by their standards that all Protestants are thoroughly sound at heart, and that whatever their minor differences may be, they play entirely on the surface; but the documents which I bring and brought forward will, at the same time, show that the Roman Catholic Faith is rotten at the core. It not only tells us of differences in their Rule of Faith, but also demonstrates that ours are only superficial, whilst theirs reach the very core. Remember, also, when I wish to know what Protestantism is, I do not take an individual's exposition, but I refer to documents. *Churches*, not *individuals*, are to be appealed to. I hold in my hands the confessions of the Reformed Churches; the Augsburg, Belgic, Scotch, English, and Westminster confessions. All these confessions show that Protestantism is perfectly sound at the heart; but the extracts which I have made from the accredited documents of the Roman Catholic Church show that it is corrupt at the very core. If I look at Protestantism, I find that there is health in the vitals, and the diversities of immortal youth in externals. If I look at Roman Catholicism, I find that her assumptions of unity, &c. &c. are merely playing upon the surface, whilst within perfect corruption prevails, infecting, and severing, and mortifying the very heart of the system. Now to show you that these allegations against Rome are neither

invidious nor unfounded, namely, that Roman Catholicism is diseased at the core, I shall for instances refer to the superstitions entertained upon the subject of relics. To pass by the records of Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, those of Henry and others, I will show you what was the state of the Church of Rome in 1750. In a directory, printed at Vienna, for the use of pilgrims visiting Rome during the jubilee, I find the following inventory: "The hair of St. Mary Magdalene, some of the fat which dropped from St. Lawrence when he was roasted alive, the stones thrown at St. Stephen, some hay from the manger at Bethlehem, the head of the woman of Samaria, the tooth of St. Stephen, the bed of the Virgin, St. Joseph's chain."

Geddes, a Roman Catholic priest, states from Mannius, that in OVIEDO, in Spain, there are the following relics:— "Some of the blessed Virgin's milk and hair, St. Peter's right foot shoe, a piece of the rock of Sinai, manna rained from heaven," &c.

In St. Peter's Church at Rome, under the eye of Gregory XVI., or at least of his predecessors, in 1753, there is "the cross on which the good thief was executed, Judas' lantern, the tail of Balaam's ass, the axe, saw, and hammer of St. Joseph, and a few nails which he had not driven."

In the same catalogue, bearing date 1753, there are in other Roman Churches "a few blossoms of Aaron's rod, one of the Virgin's combs, a piece of the Virgin's veil, as good as new, a piece of the rope with which Judas hanged himself, some butter and a small cheese made of the Virgin's milk."

In the ROMAN BREVIARY, read every day by those reverend gentlemen who accompany my learned

opponent, there are many similar accounts of precious and odorous relics, about which Mr. French may consult them.

John, fellow and monk of Glastonbury, in his chronicle or history of Glastonbury, gives the following, printed at Oxford, p. 22:—

"Part of the place where our Lord was born; part of the Lord's cloth in which he was wrapped in the manger; two pieces of the said manger; some of the gold which the wise men brought to the Lord; some of the stones of the River Jordan, where our Lord was baptized; part of one of the pitchers in which Jesus converted the water into wine; some of the stones respecting which it was said to Jesus by the devil, Order those stones to become bread, and they were blessed by the Lord; some of the fragments of the five barley loaves with which our Lord satisfied five thousand persons; part of the spot on which our Lord was transfigured; part of the stone on which our Lord stood in the temple; some of our Lord's hair; some of the hem of our Lord's garment, &c.

"Some of the pebbles and of the earth where Holy Mary wept, when she saw our Lord pierced with a lance, and her tears flowed upon the earth. Also some of all her garments; some of her tomb in the valley Jehoshaphat; the oil from a certain miraculous image of the blessed Mary; some of the milk of the blessed Mary; also the crystal cross, which the blessed Virgin brought to the renowned King Arthur; one thread from (a certain garment) of the Holy Virgin, and some of her hair, &c.

"A large bone of St. Peter; two of his teeth; some of his beard; some of his robe; a piece of his staff; some of his cross; a tooth of St. Paul; some of his beard; some

of his bones; some of his blood; five small bones of St. Andrew; two teeth, and some of his cross; some of the hair of St. John the Evangelist; a bone of St. James the Elder; a jaw-bone of St. Philip, with three teeth, also the half of one of his arms; one bone of St. Bartholomew; two thigh bones of St. Thomas."

Such is a specimen of the fruit of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith. These gross superstitions the Church of Rome's most distinguished Popes have solemnly believed. I declare the Romish apostasy must necessarily generate infidelity.

In the Roman Breviary, (Antwerp) St. Fidelis, p. 524.

"Amidst austere fasts, watchings, flagellations, pursuing himself with salutary hatred."

St. Mary Magdalene de Pazzi, Virgin, p. 591.

"She tortured her body with hair cloth, whippings, cold, hunger, &c."

"Another way," says Bishop Burnett, "was thought on, which, indeed, proved more effectual, both for recovering the people out of the superstitious fondness they had for their images and relics, and for discovering the secret impostures that had long been practised in these houses. And this way was to order the visitors to examine well all the relics and feigned images to which pilgrimages were wont to be made. In this Dr. London did great service. From Reading he writes that the chief relics of idolatry in the nation were there. There was an angel with one wing that brought over the spear's head that pierced our Saviour's side; to which he adds a long inventory of their other relics, and says there were as many more as would fill four sheets of paper. He also writes from other places that he had every where

taken down their images and trinkets. At St. Edmondsbury, as John ap Rice informed us, they found some of the coals that roasted St. Lawrence, the parings of St. Edmund's toes, St. Thomas Becket's *penknife and boots*, with as many pieces of the cross of our Saviour as would make a large whole cross. They had also relics against rain, and for hindering weeds to spring. But to pursue this further were useless, the relics were so innumerable, and the value which the people had of them may be gathered from this—that a piece of St. Andrew's finger, set in an ounce of silver, was laid to pledge by the house of Westacre for 40*l*. but the visitors, when they suppressed that house, did not think fit to redeem it at so high a rate."

I now refer to a document inscribed with THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH—Santa Rosa canonized; and therefore a saint is the performer, and the Church the admirer.

The austerities of Santa Rosa, who was canonized by Pope Clement X. A. D. 1673.—Extracted from the collection of the Constitutions published by the Popes at the solemn canonization of Saints from John XV. to Benedict XIV.; that is, from the year of our Lord 998 to the year 1729. Superintended by Justus Fontaninus, Archbishop of Ancyra. Printed at Rome, 1729, at the press of the Rev. Apostolic Chamber.—From the Bull of Canonization.

"She changed the stones and crosses, with which when going to prayer in her childhood, and as yet ignorant of the use of whips, she was loaded by her maid Marianne, who was almost the only person conscious of her mortifications, into iron chains, which she prepared as scourges, with which, after the

example of St. Dominick, every night she offered herself a bloody victim to God to avert his just anger, even to the copious effusion of streams of blood, either for the sorrows of the holy Church, or for the necessities of the endangered kingdom or the city of Lima, or *compensating the wrongs of sinners, or for making an expiation for the souls of the dead*, or for obtaining Divine aid for those who were in their last agonies; the servants being sometimes horror-struck at such dreadful blows of the chains. And when the use of these was forbidden to her, she privately encircled her waist with one of them bound thrice round her, so that it never was apparant that she wore it, except when she was under the tortures of the sciatica; which chain was afterwards loosened only by a miracle, and its links after the virgin's death were found to emit a wondrous and indescribably sweet odour. Lest any part of her innocent body should be free from suffering, she tortured her arms and limbs with penal chains, and stuffed her breast and sides with handfuls of nettles and small briars. She afterwards increased the sharpness of the haircloth, which reached from her neck beneath her knees, by needles mixed up with it, which she used for many years, until she was ordered to put it off on account of the frequent vomiting of blood. When she laid aside this punishment, she substituted another garment less injurious to her health, but not less troublesome. For beneath it every movement was painful to her. Her feet only were free from these sufferings, which, either by hitting them with stones or by the burning of an oven, she did not suffer to be free from torture. . . .

"She fixed upon her head a tin

crown, with sharp little nails in it, and for many years never put it on without receiving wounds; when she grew older, this was replaced by one which was armed with ninety-nine points. . . .

"She desired the hardness of her bed to be such that it should rather drive away than invite sleep, so that, when about to sleep, the same should be both a bed to her and an instrument of torture. Her pillow was either an unpolished trunk, or stones concealed for this purpose; which bed she afterwards so filled with sharp pieces of tiles and triangular pieces of broken jugs, that the sharp points of each should be turned to her body; nor did she try to sleep until she had embittered her mouth with a draught of gall.

"Near the time of her death, Rosa throughout Lent alternately sang the canticles and praises of God every day for a whole hour with a very melodious bird, in so orderly a manner, that when the bird sang the virgin was silent, and when the virgin sang, the bird, who was most attentive, ceased to sing. She invited, moreover, the inanimate plants, after an unheard-of fashion, to praise and to pray to God, pronouncing the verse, 'Bless the Lord, all ye things which bud on the earth;' and she so visibly persuaded them, that *the tops of the trees touched the earth*, as if adoring their Creator with a solemn veneration."

The following testimony of Father Dominic Corsano to the virtues of Liguori, before the Sacred Congregation of Rites, describes the claims of Liguori. Four Popes lauded Liguori, and the fanatic was canonized in 1839.

"I know for a certainty that this servant of God constantly scourged himself, unbloodily and bloodily, and, besides the unbloody scourgings en

joined by his rule, he was wont to punish himself every day in the morning before the usual hour of rising, and in the evening after the signal for repose. On Saturdays he scourged himself till the blood flowed; and these scourgings were so violent, and caused so much blood to gush from his limbs, that not only was his linen always covered with it, but you might even see the walls of his small room stained, and even books which he kept in it were sprinkled with it.

“Also, from what I have seen with my own eyes, and have heard declared by certain fathers, who are worthy of credit, I know that this servant of God macerated his body, also, with haircloth with sharp points in it, and with chains, as well on the arms as on the legs, which he carried with him till dinner-time; and these for the most part were so armed with sharp points, that they filled with horror all who ever saw them. I have heard say, also, that he had a dress filled with a coat of mail with iron points; that he had bandages of camel’s hair; and other instruments of penance were casually seen by me, and by others of my companions, notwithstanding his zealous and circumspect secrecy.”

St. Patrick. From the Roman Breviary, on the 17th of March.

“They say that he was wont to repeat daily the whole Psalter, together with the Canticles, and two hundred hymns and prayers; three hundred times on each day to worship God upon his knees, and in each canonical hour of the day to sign himself one hundred times with the sign of the cross. Dividing the night into three portions, he spent the first in running through one hundred psalms, and in two genuflexions; the second in running

through the other fifty psalms, immersed in cold water, with his heart, eyes, and hands raised to heaven; he yielded the third part to a short sleep upon a hard stone.”

Such are the fruits of my opponent’s Rule of Faith, such the progeny of the *soi-disant* Apostolic Church. It is an outrage on decency to call such a Church Christian. Her theology is really awful. These proofs alone show to demonstration that the root of the system is radically diseased. At the very core are the germs of contamination, on the surface the efflorescence of corruption the most awful. I therefore implore you, my Roman Catholic friends, to lay these things seriously to heart. I am not reading, recollect, from Protestant documents, but from documents accredited by your Church—documents bearing the seal and sanction of the Pope and Cardinals besides. These awful abominations contain the stamp and imprimatur of your Church. Again I quote from one of the most distinguished monuments of Roman Catholic erudition:—

From the Acts of the Saints, May. tom. vi. Printed at Antwerp, 1668. On the 26th of May. From the Life of St. Philip Neri, Founder of the Congregation of Priests.

“About the year 1555, when Philip, who had many followers, journeyed to the place where are the baths of Diocletian, he saw standing upon a wall, which had fallen down from age, the devil in the form of a man; and, when he had observed more closely, he beheld him at one time appear as a youth, and presently afterwards as an old man. Hence discovering the tricks of the devil, he ordered him in the name of Christ to discover himself. Overcome by this, the devil betook him-

self to flight, and as he departed he filled the place with so offensive a stench that even the beasts could not tolerate it; and thus made it evident to Philip and the other spectators who he was.

"The devil one night appeared to Francis of Terrara, one of his disciples, in the form of the most holy Virgin, with the design of deceiving him more easily under that form. When he reported this the next morning to Philip, Philip said to him, The most holy mother of God did not present herself to you in that form, as you think, but the devil: as soon, therefore, as this vision appears to you again, I command you to spit in the face of the person who appears. On the following night, when the man of Terrara was engaged in very ardent prayer, the devil stood by him resplendent in the same form and lustre. He, however, mindful of the blessed father's injunctions, quickly spat in the devil's face. Confounded and disgracefully defeated by this act, the devil vanished."

Life of the Abbot St. Walthen. The 3rd of August.

"When upon a certain occasion the saint stood praying before the great altar, with his eyes and hands raised to heaven, the evil spirit transfigured himself into many shapes: he first ran about the pavement in the form of a mouse, playing many antics; afterwards in the shape of a grunting pig; afterwards in the shape of a black dog barking; afterwards of a howling wolf; and, lastly, of a roaring long-horned bull.

"But the saint caused all these illusory forms to vanish, by making the sign of the cross. At last that spirit, who has a thousand artifices, and who in a thousand ways endeavours to disturb quiet hearts, exhibited himself in the form of a

great soldier in armour, sitting upon the back of a horrible horse with a whale's hide, which emitted fire and smoke from its nostrils and mouth, and shook his lance against the man who was praying. The saint jumping up as fast as he could by the impulse of the Spirit, and going to the altar, reverently took up the ivory pix, which contained the holy body of the Lord, and signing himself with it, and running like a second David against the infernal Goliath, and inventing a new name for him, under the dictation of the Spirit, said, 'Behold, oh execrable mouse, oh terrible soldier, thou satellite of Satan, thy Judge is about to send thee into hell, wait for him if thou darest!' Overcome and confused by this speech, the infernal horseman disappeared."

From a standard Roman Catholic work, "The Devotion of the Sacred Heart," I extract the following horrible blasphemy:—

"Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be! come and behold! Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breasts to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, *though unfortunately proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost*, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate!! Her throne, though so exalted, has nothing forbidding, nothing dreadful; her heart is all love, all tenderness. If you have the least remains of confidence and reliance on her protection, doubt not she will carry you through her own most blessed heart, in the most speedy and most favourable manner, to the truly merciful and most sacred heart of her son Jesus."—Twelfth Edition. "With an Appendix on the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; Prayers for the Exercise of

that Devotion; and the Indult of his Holiness Pope Pius in favour of it. For the Use of the Midland District. London: Printed and sold by Keating and Brown, 38, Duke Street, 1821."

From the same.

"* * * I reverence you, O sacred Virgin Mary, the holy ark of the covenant; and together with all the good thoughts of all good men upon earth, and the blessed spirits in heaven, do bless and praise you infinitely, for that you are the great mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all that they can ask and demand of the blessed Trinity. Hail Mary!"

The more we search into the depths of the Roman Catholic system, the more awful are the proofs of idolatry, fanaticism, and apostasy. The nearer we approach the heart, the more offensive is the rottenness we detect. She starts with a false Rule of Faith, and ends in a perfect puddle of fanaticism, creature-worship, and superstition.

Then, again, I might show you, still further, that the Roman Catholic Church is diseased at the heart, by quoting the names given to the Pope; such as "The Vicar of Christ, Pope, *Father of Fathers*, the Pontiff of Christians, High-priest, the Prince of Priests, the Head of the Body—that is, of the Church, the Foundation of the Building of the Church, the Father and Doctor of all the Faithful, the Ruler of the House of God, the Keeper of God's Vineyard, the Bridegroom of the Church, the Ruler of the Apostolic See, the Universal Bishop."

Instances of the titles of God and Christ being applied to the Pope in Council, taken from Labbé and Cossart, "Holy Councils," tom. xiv. page 109. Printed at Paris, 1672.

An Extract from a Speech made by Christopher Marcellus, in the 4th Session of the Council of Lateran, an. Dom. 1512, wherein he thus addresses Pope Julius II. :—

"For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the ruler, thou art the cultivator; finally, thou art another God upon earth."

Extract from a Speech made by Simon Begnius, Bishop of Modrusch, in the 6th Session of the Council of Lateran, an. Dom. 1513, wherein he thus speaks of Pope Leo X. :—

"But weep not, daughter of Sion, for behold, 'the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David,' comes; behold, God has raised up to thee a Saviour, who shall save you from the hands of the spoilers."

* * * We have expected thee, O most blessed Leo, as the Saviour that was to come."

Extract from a Speech made by Baltassar del Rio, a Scholastic of Mentese, Prothonotary of the Apostolic See, &c.

"Like the lion, the king of quadrupeds, you, another lion, not another king of men only, but appointed the king of kings, and the monarch of the whole earth, would bring back, allure, and recal to your fold other sheep, which are not of this fold; 'Gird thyself, therefore, with thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty.'"

Extract from a Speech made by the Rev. Father, the Lord Anthony Pucci, in the 9th Session of the 5th Council of Lateran, an. Dom. 1514, before Leo X. :—

"Although the sight of your divine majesty does not a little terrify me, who am beginning to speak." Again — "Not ignorant that all power both in heaven and in earth is given to you only by the Lord." And again—"As if that

prophetical saying ought again to be fulfilled in you, the only true and lawful vicar of Christ and God, 'All the kings of the earth shall worship him, and all nations shall serve him.'"

Extract from a Speech made by Stephen, Archbishop of Patras. Sess. 10, an. 1515, Leo X.

"At thy command, O most holy father, who hast in thee the fulness of power, a true reformation shall be preached. * * * Snatch up, therefore, the two-edged sword of the divine power, which is given to thee, and order, command, and decree, that an universal peace and alliance take place among Christians for the space of ten years at least, and bind the kings to it in the fetters of the greatness of the great King, and bind the nobles to it in the iron manacles of thy censures, since *all power is given to thee in heaven and earth.*"

Adoration of Pope Pius II.

"The Pope was conducted to the church of St. Peter, and after being elevated on the great altar, at the foot of which are the tombs of the holy apostles, he sat upon the throne that was prepared for him, and was there adored by the cardinals, afterwards by the bishops, and lastly by the whole people, who crowded to kiss his feet."—*Fleury's Eccl. Hist.* t. xv. b. 3. Printed at Nismes, 1779.

These awful and blasphemous titles were liberally assigned to the Popes just before the Reformation. The Romish Rule is destitute of some of the greatest and most peculiar blessings which our Rule of Faith presents. You will often hear a Roman Catholic talk of liberty of conscience just as if he possessed it. Now, in the same encyclical letter which I quoted, as addressed by the present Pope to the different archbishops and bishops, that document contains the following language:—

"From this polluted fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favour and in defence of liberty of conscience, for *which most pestilential error* the course is opened, &c."

Again his Holiness adds:—

"Hither tends that worst and never-sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press for the diffusion of all manner of writing."

Now, from this fearful proscription of liberty of conscience and of a free press, our Rule of Faith most gloriously delivers us. Mr. French, therefore, when he stands up, must either say, I hold and maintain liberty of conscience, and cast my present Pope overboard, with all the rest concerned in the same error; or denounce it, and thus be united for once. Again, we are delivered by our Rule of Faith from all the iniquities of that sink of uncleanness, the Confessional, to which point I alluded on a preceding evening. As I may not give a sufficiently strict delineation, I shall go at once to your own Church, and read from a pamphlet by the Rev. Mr. Nolan, formerly a priest of the Church of Rome. This Rev. Mr. Nolan was once disciplined in, and habituated to, all the practices of the confessional while a priest.

"There is not a Romish priest extant, who has acted in the capacity of a confessor, but must admit the truth of this observation, that each day's confessions had been the continued causes of unchaste excitements in his mind. *Oh, my friends, there is no Romish clergyman, no matter how sanctified he may appear in your estimation, but must allow that the first subject of his own confession to another priest is an acknowledgment of his having indulged in unchaste thoughts, on account of the*

indecent recitals made before him in the Confessional. I could relate many practical proofs from others corroborative of my statement, were it not that a principle of honour prescribes the necessity of silence in this respect.

“Whilst I thus uplift the veil of mystic darkness from over the Confessional, must not you yourselves admit, that this pretended tribunal of forgiveness has been often, to your own knowledge, converted by the priest into an apology for crime? *Has not this practice of inquisitorial debasement often exposed the weakness of the penitent, and has it not consequently furnished the lecherous dispositions of many priests with an easier and more appropriate mode of seduction? Has not the innocence of virginity been often despoiled through the confessional, and has not the morality of otherwise virtuous women been frequently corrupted through it?* Is there a single diocese in Ireland but furnishes proofs of Romish clergymen who have been suspended for the notorious crime of having converted the tribunal of confession into an apology for wickedness? The very diocese in which I officiated as a Romish clergyman, affords sufficient proofs of the correctness of my statement. Yes, and were the privacy of the confessional to be fully developed, it would then be easily seen that such abuses at confession as have been known would stand as rare specks on the general sheet of confessional corruption.

“It frequently occurs that when an unmarried female goes to confession, the first acknowledgment of her guilt is that of having indulged unchaste thoughts. Now, as one unchaste thought in the Romish Church is considered more heinous than another, the priest is in duty bound to ask the penitent to whom

did her thoughts refer. If her thoughts were in reference to a married person, then her crime is considered more enormous than if they regarded an unmarried individual. If these unchaste desires were in reference to a priest, they are considered still more enormous; and hence it is, that while duty obliges the priest to put such interrogatories to arrive at the Romish distinction of the heinousness of crimes, he also becomes furnished with the means of knowing the penitent's attachment to himself; and, consequently, should criminal motives mingle with the indelicate inquiry, the penitent may be easily made the victim of sacerdotal depravity.”

Such is the testimony of one priest; I now subjoin the testimony of another, the Rev. David O'Crolly:—

“The crime ‘solicitatio mulieris in tribunali,’ to solicit a female in the tribunal, *is not of such rare occurrence, and would be very common but for the dread of detection.*”

And again, on clerical celibacy:—

“Innumerable scandals flow from the enforcement of this austere discipline. The most severe laws are found on the statute book against sacerdotal incontinence; from the nature and provisions of which, to say nothing of facts that are constantly before the world, it may be inferred, *that it is a crime of frequent commission, and at times under circumstances peculiarly scandalous.*”

From these abominations, our Rule of Faith delivers us. That blessed authority of the Bible would not smile on such an institute for a moment—the glorious fruit of the Gospel is incompatible with all such manner of filthiness of the flesh and spirit—thus we are delivered by our Rule of Faith. In the Decretals of Gratian, dist. 39, Qui non

habet uxorem loco illius concubinam habere debet. From this abomination our Rule delivers us.

Again, to show you that the Roman Catholic Church is conscious of being corrupted at the core, I state to you the fact that the perusal by the laity, of the Bible, is positively interdicted by the Bull *Unigenitus*; and when Dr. Doyle, and Dr. Murray Archbishop of Dublin, were asked if that Bull was binding on the priesthood of Ireland, he said it was. It is declared in the Bull *Unigenitus*, "that the reading of the Bible by the people in the vulgar tongue is heretical and pernicious!" and this was approved by those bishops of the Church of Rome. Even if Mr. French should cast the Right Rev. Dr. Murray and the bull *Unigenitus* overboard, still he would come to this—that the Rule, according to which he is to interpret the Bible, is an impracticable one, for he must not interpret a single text till he has got (what never has been found, and what never can or will be found), the *unanimous* consent of the fathers. I implore you, my dear Roman Catholic friends, to weigh these things. Your Church positively interdicts your reading of the sacred volume. The Church of Rome has laid a mighty and a massive stone, which she suffers not to be rolled away, on the font of living waters; although she has no more right to do so than she has to scarf up the sun with her mantle, or prohibit your access to those springs of waters which flow from the earth you walk on. If these then are the results, the just and legitimate results of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, I implore every Roman Catholic to remember that they are most bitterly plundered and beguiled. The Church of Rome has promised you truth, and has given

you fanaticism and superstition: she has promised you purity, and given you the confessional; she has promised to make you wise, and she makes you fools; she has promised to make earth a paradise, and, wherever her power has promulgated her principles she has turned it into a pandemonium. The Church of Rome has not only done all this, but she has given you a false Gospel: she has given you purgatory, and penance, and saints, and works of supererogation, and creature-merits, and all the full-blown fruits of the Galatian Gospel, instead of that Gospel which unfolds a Saviour, into whose bosom you have instant access without any other mediator; in whose blood you have free, full, and everlasting forgiveness. She has made a parade and a boast of Romish unity before you, and tried to dazzle your eyes with arrogant assumptions of Roman sanctity. Will you sacrifice your senses, your consciences, your *reason*, your understanding, your Bible, your privileges, in order to attain a pretended unity, which, when you come to look at it, is like the mirage of the desert, which, seeing from afar, the thirsty pilgrim expects will by-and-by satisfy and refresh him; but soon finds it is only a burning and arid sand, that blasts his hopes with bitterness, having mocked him with the semblance of reality.

Again, (I am obliged to be hurried in my way of speaking, because I have so much ground to get over) let me call on you to remember although I am no prophet, the course which Mr. French this evening will be likely to pursue. He will give you a long catalogue of extravagant opinions and vagaries which nobody but himself says is entertained by this and that doctor and reformer. But whatever examples he may adduce must be utterly use-

less, because all such quotations do not touch our Rule of Faith. And why? Our Rule of Faith, the Bible, was written 1500 years before Luther existed; our Rule of Faith was complete 1500 before the Reformation; and, therefore, if he quotes from Reformers any notions contradictory or otherwise, it does not touch our Rule of Faith, and, therefore, I said, when he shall bring forward his packet, which closes his whole catalogue, I shall just sit still and listen as sweetly and safely as if I were sitting in this well-built house, with the winds whistling at the windows and the rain pattering on the tiles above my head. It does not touch the question at issue.—In the next place, he will in all probability bring forward, in his last and dying speech [laughter], an account of all the horrors of the Reformation, about Henry the Eighth, who, by the bye, lived and died a Roman Catholic; he will tell you also about Luther, Calvin, and a great many other “monsters” who existed at that period, of whom he has many original dreams; and he will no doubt ask, with an air of great pomposity—Is it possible that God could have used such instruments to reform the Church of Rome? Let me observe, if our Reformers were not likely to be used as reformers of the Church, that the following Roman Catholic heroes were less likely to be chosen defenders. I state the following facts, therefore, for our defence on this subject. Mr. French will say, Is it possible God could have chosen such men to reform the Church of Rome? I reply, Would God have employed men a hundred times worse to defend it? I shall give you the following statement of the priests made by themselves respecting themselves:—

RAPIN, vol. i. fol. lib. 14. p. 697.

The Council of Basil was called in 1431 by Martin V. who was succeeded by Eugenius IV.

“In 1435 it set about the reformation of the head and members in good earnest, by abolishing first-fruits, and settling the rights of the apostolic chamber. The head would not submit. He published a bull to translate it to Ferrara. The Cardinals went to Ferrara, and afterwards to Florence. The council of Basil continued their proceedings against Eugenius, deposed him, and elected Felix V. The two popes and councils excommunicated each other, calling each other the synagogues of Satan. Felix resigned in 1449.”

The Advice and Exhortation of the Legates of the Apostolic See to the Fathers in the Council of Trent, which was read at the first Session. Labbé and Cossart, vol. xiv. p. 734, A.D. 1545.

* * * “In order, therefore, to begin with that of which we ought first to be admonished, each of us ought in the first place to set before his eyes the things which are expected from this council, whence every one will easily understand what a responsibility rests upon him. To comprehend all things in a few words, they are the same which are contained in the bull for the appointment of the council,—namely, the extirpation of heresies, and the reformation of ecclesiastical discipline and morals, and finally the eternal peace of the whole Church. * * * That we should at length do this, justice itself requires of us, namely, *that we should confess ourselves as guilty, before the tribunal of God's mercy, of all these evils by which the flock of Christ is oppressed*; and transferring to ourselves, not so much from a feeling of piety as

from a sense of justice, the sins of all, because in truth we are in a great measure the cause of these evils, we should implore the Divine mercy through Jesus Christ. But if any one thinks that what we have said, namely, that we who are pastors have given rise to the evils by which the Church is oppressed, is too severe, and an exaggeration rather than truth, experience, which cannot deceive, will prove it. Let us observe, therefore, a little the evils by which the Church is oppressed, and at the same time also our own sins. But can any one number these, which, *with the other ills, surpass in number the sea-sand, and cry out even to heaven?*"

Fifth Council of Lateran. Session 6, An. Dom. 1513. P. Leo X. Phil. Labbé, and Cossart, vol. xiv. p. 149. Printed at Paris. 1672. Simon Begni, Bishop of Modrusch.

"I have always deemed it to be necessary first of all that the head of our faith, I mean the Roman Church, be quieted, restored, and reformed. * * *

"It is a matter of regret and sorrow that faith, piety, and religion have grown so cold, I might almost say have become so corrupted, that scarcely any vestiges of them remain; and that the faith and fervour which dwelt in the minds of our forefathers have so cooled in us, when the Church, free from the persecution of heretics, enjoys the greatest peace and liberty, that we may truly say with Jeremiah, 'From the daughter of Sion all her beauty is departed,' the beauty, namely, of innocence and chastity. 'Her princes have become like rams; enemies have entered her sanctuary.' They have polluted the churches; her virgins and young men have gone into captivity. *The priests and the ancients have despised*

God. There is no law or commandment; judgment is perverted."

Extract from a Speech delivered by Peter Fragus, D.D., to the Fathers of the Council of Trent, in 1551.

* * * "And I testify, O most august fathers, that this place, which unworthy as I am, I have ascended, has never so much dreaded the dangers of the Christian republic, or dissensions, or schemes, as *our most corrupt morals and our offences*; more especially when I consider that we have fallen so low that we can neither bear our ills, nor their remedies.

LABBÉ, tom. xiv. p. 1047. A. D. 1547.

An Extract from a Speech delivered to the Fathers of the Council of Trent, on the first Sunday in Lent in the year 1547, by Friar George, of St. James, of the Order of Preachers of the Convent of St. Dominic at Lisbon.

* * * "And as if it were not a very great evil that Christians should have degenerated from their fathers, and as if it were not hard and grievous that they should have departed much or little from their God, it was besides brought about by the cunning and temptations of the serpent, that they should fall into the hands of *robbers*, of men who were covetous, cruel, hungry, insatiable, deaf to reason, inexorable, oppressive magistrates, impious princes, and *infidel prelates*."

Mezerai's Chronological Abridgement of the Sixteenth Century.

"The disorders and vices of the clergy reached the highest point, and became so public as to render them the objects of the hatred and contempt of the people. * * * The churches were without pastors, the monasteries without monks, the

regular clergy without discipline, the churches and holy houses in ruins, and changed into dens of robbers. The bishops fled from their dioceses as if they were frightful solitudes. The amusements of Paris and the occupations of the court were their usual occupation."

LABBÉ, tom. xiv. p. 929.

Extract from a Speech upon the last Judgment, delivered by Cornelius, Bishop of Bitonto, on the third Sunday of Advent, in the Council of Trent, An. Dom. 1545.

* * * "Has not that fervent love towards each other and the state perished, upon account of which formerly all Christians were called brothers, a sweet and precious name! so that the prediction of St. Paul is fulfilled, 'Men shall be lovers of themselves?' Unless truly this had perished, there would not have been a general degeneracy from those holy morals, and from those honourable ordinances, which, when they were observed, always enlarged our commonwealth. For with what *monsters of baseness*, with what *a heap of filth*, with what *a pestilence* are not both the priests and the people corrupted in the holy Church of God? I place my case in your hands, O fathers. Begin with the sanctuary of God, and see if *any modesty, any shame, any hope, any reasonable expectation remains of good living*; if there be not *unrestrained and unconquerable lust, a singular audacity, and incredible wickedness*. Alas! 'How is the gold obscured, and how is its fine colour changed!' There are those two bloodsuckers, which always exclaim, Bring, bring—the one the mother, the other the nurse of all evils—I mean *covetousness and ambition*, each a subtle evil, each a secret poison, a pestilence, and the monster

of the world. Also, whilst virtue and learning are neglected by those whom we ought to follow as living and breathing laws, vice and ignorance are raised in their stead to the highest honours; and it has at length been brought to pass, that edification has made place for destruction, example for scandal, morals for corruption, the observance of the law for its contempt, strictness for laxity, mercy for impunity, piety for *hypocrisy and smoke*, preaching for contention and pride, and, for the vilest gain, and to sum all in one sentence, which it is grievous to utter, the odour of life for the *odour of death*."

Such are public testimonies to her dreadful corruption and her canonized abominations, by the most eminent members of the Roman Church.

A reformation in any shape—a whirlwind, a storm, was infinitely preferable to such a sink. If then God would not have used such men as Luther to *reform* the Church, it is yet more obvious that he would not have chosen such priests and prelates as those of Rome to defend it.

The very worst of those who followed in the train of the Reformation were innocents compared to those monsters in the Council of Trent.

The next sketch that I would add is, that of the kings who defended the Church of Rome. I pass by Francis I., the exploits of Charles V. of Germany, the atrocities of the Duke of Alva, the cruelties of Philip II. of Spain, and that pet place, the Inquisition. I shall take the reference which my learned antagonist made last night—the Eve of St. Bartholomew. I will first show that the Pope was the instigator of that cruel and atrocious massacre.

Letters of Pope Pius V., book iii. let.

45, printed at Antwerp, 1640.

"To our Most dear Son in Christ,
Charles, the Most Christian King
of the French.

"The public joy of this city has very much augmented our pleasure; which at the first, certain intelligence of so great a victory rejoiced and does rejoice, as if some domestic slaughter and intestine war were removed. It now only remains, that your majesty, in such prosperous circumstances, should remit nothing of your usual diligence, application and perseverance, nor afford our common enemies an opportunity of confirming their courage, and collecting again their forces, but that you shall make a good use of the victory, and at length put an end to this most grievous war: to which we exhort your majesty with all possible and conceivable earnestness. For we know that there will not be wanted those who, either in the name of friendship, relationship, or piety, will intercede with your majesty for many of your enemies, and of the enemies of the Almighty; moved, therefore, by our paternal care for your welfare, and by our office, we admonish you not to be moved by their prayers, so as not to inflict just punishment in those things which are ordained by law; lest, if thus influenced by private reasons, you should yield more to flesh and blood than to a just vengeance, the anger of God should burn against you, as it did against Saul, in proportion as he has imparted to you of his goodness. For what would this be, but to make the blessings of God, that is to say, the victory obtained, of no effect? the fruit of which victory consists in this—that, by a just animadversion, the wicked heretics, the common enemies, being removed out of the way, its former

peace and tranquillity may be restored to that kingdom. * * For the sake, however, of obtaining so wholesome a result, your majesty ought to punish those who have taken up wicked arms against the Almighty God and your majesty, and to appoint inquisitors of heresy in every town, and to do all other things by which the so much troubled affairs of that kingdom, by the aid of God, may at length be improved and restored to their former state.—*Dated St. Peter's, Rome, under the Fisherman's Seal, the 20th day of October, 1559.*"

Having seen the instigator of these wholesale murders to have been Pope Pius V., let us now hear the account of the scene from a Roman Catholic historian:—

Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

Mezerai's History of France, fol. vol. ii. p. 1098. Paris, 1646.

"The daylight, which discovered so many crimes which the darkness of an eternal night ought for ever to have concealed, did not soften their ardour by these objects of pity, but exasperated them still more. The populace and the most dastardly being warmed by the smell of blood, sixty thousand men, transported with this fury and armed in different ways, ran about wherever example, vengeance, rage, and the desire of plunder transported them. The air resounded with a horrible tempest of the hisses, blasphemies, and oaths of the murderers, of the breaking open of doors and windows, of the firing of pistols and guns, of the pitiable cries of the dying, of the lamentations of the women, whom they dragged by the hair, of the noise of carts, some loaded with the booty of the houses they pillaged, others with the dead bodies, which they cast into the Seine, so that in this

confusion they could not hear each other speak in the streets, or, if they distinguished certain words, they were these furious expressions—'Kill, stab, throw them out of the window.' A dreadful and inevitable death presented itself in every shape. Some were shot on the roofs of houses, others were cast out of the windows, some were cast into the water and knocked on the head with blows of iron bars or clubs, some were killed in their beds, some in the garrets, others in cellars; wives in the arms of their husbands, husbands on the bosom of their wives, sons at the feet of their fathers. They neither spared the aged, nor women great with child, nor even infants. It is related, that a man was seen to stab one of them who played with the beard of its murderer, and that a troop of little boys dragged another in its cradle into the river.

"The streets were paved with the bodies of the dead, or the dying—the gateways were blocked up with them. There were heaps of them in the squares, the small streams were filled with blood, which flowed in great torrents into the river. Finally, to sum up in a few words what took place in these three days, six hundred houses were repeatedly pillaged, and four thousand persons massacred, with all the confusion and barbarity that can be imagined."

Similar massacres took place throughout France: at Meaux, at Troyes, at Orleans, Nevers and La Charité, at Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Lyons. I only insert Mezerai's account of the barbarities committed at Lyons.

"They began with the prison of the Cordeliers, thence they ran to the archbishop's prison, after that to the royal prison, which is called Rouan, and to other places in which the governor had shut up from

seven to eight hundred persons, all of whom they knocked on the head, cut in pieces, strangled, or drowned; afterwards they spread through the town to dispatch the rest in the houses and to collect the spoil after the victory. All these unhappy people, with the exception of some of the fattest, from whom the apothecaries took some grease, were dragged into the Rhone. It was a truly pitiable sight to behold this river entirely tinged with blood, and infected with corruption, carrying upon its waters six or seven hundred bodies, many of them tied together to long poles, some with their heads, some with their arms and legs cut off, every where gashed with great and deep wounds, and so disfigured as not to retain the human form. Hence these horrible proofs of Lionnese cruelty passing before the towns of Dauphinè and Provence, raised rather their compassion than their fury, and made them detest the barbarity of the massacres.

"During two months this horrible and cruel tempest overspread France, in some places more, and in some less, and destroyed not less than 25,000 persons."

After reading these dreadful brutalities, inflicted at the instigation of a Pope, and in the name—the injured name of religion, it cannot be a useless inquiry if we ascertain if the outrage was deplored and grieved. It is, therefore, a fair question—With what feelings did the Church of Rome look upon this massacre, this spectacle of blood, this tragedy of many horrors? If the Lord Jesus Christ had heard the awful tidings—he that wept in Gethsemane and died on Calvary—he would have mourned over the horrid cruelties, and rebuked in heaven's uncompromising tones the murderers, mitred, or crowned, who urged it on. But how did the pro-

fessing *Vicar* of Christ look on it? This is a decisive question. How did the HEAD of the Church look on it? How did he, who said he sate in Christ's room and had Christ's functions, look upon this aceldama, this scene of blood? We read that, so far from deploring and deprecating the spectacle, the bleeding head of Coligne, one of the most distinguished Protestants of the time, was sent to Rome to feast the eyes of the cardinals and Pope [sensation], and Pope Gregory XIII., distinguished by the same penchant for heretic blood as his predecessor, sent Cardinal Ursini to thank the French king; and the Pope, meek man! gloried in the murders, celebrated a jubilee, and struck a medal to commemorate it.

Go to your bloody rites again!

The hall of horrors and the aggressor's pen,
Recording answers shrieked upon the rack,
Smile o'er the gaspings of spine-broken men!

Preach, perpetrate damnation in your den;
Then let your altars, ye blasphemers, peal
With thanks to heaven that let you loose again,

To practise deeds with torturing fire and steel,

No eye may search—no tongue may challenge or reveal.

Can the Rule of Faith be Divine which generates, *usque ad nauseam*, fanaticism and murder, bloodshed and cruelty?

Mezerai adds—"THE HOLY FATHER and all his court displayed a great rejoicing, and went in procession to the church of St. Louis, to render thanks to God for so happy a success.

"In Spain there was no less joy than at Rome, and they preached up this action before Philip in the name of the triumph of the church militant."

Thuanus states in his History, book liii. (London, 1733):—"An account of the Parisian tumult having arrived, it was received with

astonishing joy at Rome. For, the letters of the Pope's legate having been read in the senate of the cardinals, in which he certified to the Pope that it was done with the king's consent, and by his command, it was instantly resolved that the Pope, with the cardinals, should straightway go to the church of St. Mark, and should solemnly return thanks to the Lord for so great a blessing conferred upon the Roman see and the Christian world; also that, on the Monday following, a solemn service should be performed in the temple of Minerva, and that the Pope and cardinals should assist at it; that thence a jubilee should be published in the whole Christian world. Its causes were declared to be, that they should return thanks to God for the destruction of the enemies of the truth, and of the Church in France, &c. In the evening, fireworks were discharged at Adrian's mole, in token of the public rejoicing, fires were kindled everywhere in the streets, and nothing was omitted which usually took place at all the greatest victories of the Church of Rome.

"These things being done at Rome, Cardinal Fabius Ursinus was appointed as legate to France, a cross having been solemnly delivered to him, which is the ensign of so honourable an embassy, and he immediately commenced his journey."

Now, if it is not likely, from the account which Mr. French's poetic fancy gives of Knox and Calvin, that God would have used these Reformers to purify the Church, it is, *a fortiori*, clearer to our mind that God would not have employed these kings and popes, personations of cruelty, to defend and perpetuate the Church. But not only do I thus extirpate all the puerilities of Mr. French about our Reformers, but I thus show up the fountains

of infallibility, and proofs overwhelming, that wherever Christ's promise, "Lo, I am with you to the end of the world," has been fulfilled, it has never been applied or realised in the case of the Church of Rome. Remember that, should Mr. French be pleased, in his erratic fancy, to give you a long rigmarole about Henry VIII. and Luther and Calvin, he is arguing, as usual, most powerfully against himself, and demonstrating a lesson which this discussion will demonstrate to you all—the necessity of trusting to no arm of flesh, much less to that of the Pope, and of appealing from all to the oracles of God.

In vindication of Luther, while he is neither our Pope nor rule, I have much to say. You must remember that Luther was accustomed to the company of these very priests, whose characters I have read as given by themselves; and therefore, it is no wonder that he did retain some of their corruptions. If a man comes out of the company of chimney-sweeps, is it not probable that he will have some patches of soot upon his coat? Luther was a monk, and long accustomed to the monkish abominations and uncleanness. Why, it certainly would have been a wonder if he had come to be a Protestant without carrying a remnant of pollution with him; and therefore, when Mr. French describes all the corruptions of our Reformers, he is just telling you what his Church made them, and, by implication, preaching our Rule of Faith, the word of the living God, as the only indestructible thing. When he is pleased, however, to single out the sins and cover up the virtues of the Reformers, he acts unfairly by them. He might, in the same way, tell you of David's sins without telling you of

David's virtues. He might tell us of Paul's persecutions when he was persecutor and blasphemer, and withhold from us Paul's conversion. He might ask—Would God employ David to rule his saints and write his word, and Paul to spread and propagate the truth? My antagonist (though I am no prophet, yet I know the course he will pursue) will perhaps tell you what Luther's confessions were. Remember St. Paul's confessions, in the seventh of Romans.

WHATEVER OF DEFECT, OR SIN, OR IMPERFECTION, IS IN OUR REFORMED CHURCHES, IN OUR FORMULARIES OF DEVOTION, IN OUR REFORMERS, AND SUCH THERE ARE, IS HUMAN AND FROM POPERY. WHATEVER IS HOLY, DIVINE, IS FROM SCRIPTURE. WE DESIRE TO GET RID MORE AND MORE OF THE BITS OF POPISH LEAVEN, AND TO BE A NEW AND UNLEAVENED LUMP OF SINCERITY AND TRUTH.

Our Rule of Faith is neither the Scotch nor English Articles or Prayer-books, but the Bible. Touch it at any point, and I meet you foot to foot. It is our palladium. But our Reformers you may feast *ad libitum*. God uses as his own instruments, and to promote his own ends, various means: the hurricane, which, while it destroys fair dwellings, yet purifies the air. He uses the earthquake when needful, to give rest and peace to an over-agitated earth. He uses thunder, and storm, and lightning, which, whilst they do plentiful evil, are yet the harbingers of varied and universal good. So in this case. The fact is, that the Church of Rome had raised a high wall between the sinner and his Saviour. It is a most immaterial question, whether God employed the battering-ram, or the artillery, or the lightning, or the Reformers, or any body else.

The matter of weight and rejoicing is, that this impervious wall has been thrown down, and that, standing on its wreck, the sinner can now freely and without price see the glory of the countenance of his manifested God.

In closing this, my last speech but one, I repeat, Mr. French has commented on Luther, Calvin, Knox, &c.—on the works of names I never heard of, Thorndyke, Montague, &c. He has visited with his fulminations Prayer-books and Homilies, BUT HAS NEVER TOUCHED OUR RULE OF FAITH. He has mutilated his own by kicking its constituents in all directions. I have shattered the Papal Rule of Faith to atoms. Mr. French will hobble on—the ruling passion strong in death—shouting victory because no one else will shout for him. Of our Reformers we at once feel that all their errors were taken from Rome, but that all their virtues were borrowed from the Bible. The nearer that you live to the Bible, our Protestant Rule of Faith, the more will you resemble a saint, an angel; but the nearer you conform to the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith, as my illustrations from Romish history demonstrate, the more speedily will you sink to a level with a demon. [Sensation.]

[The reverend gentleman's hour here ended.]

Mr. FRENCH.—There is something this evening so peculiarly sweet, gentle, meek, and alluring in the accents of my learned friend, that I begin to be apprehensive for the Catholicity of my brethren in this room. [Laughter.] I am sure, gentlemen, that if ever a specimen was exhibited of the milk of Christianity to smooth over the poor benighted Catholics, it is upon the present occasion. I came into this

room, gentlemen, with the intention of adhering closely to the Rule of Faith, and of proving, most satisfactorily, to the Protestant part of my audience, that the Rule of Faith laid down by my learned friend was fallacious in the extreme. I came to-night to follow up the subject; and this evening, my friend, knowing well the solid matter I had to urge against him, endeavours to divert you from the object by a long string of unfounded calumnies against the holy religion which I profess. I say unfounded in the extreme, because the cruelties of state policy have nothing to do with the fundamental articles of the Christian religion. It is not argument, my friends. It does not contribute to show how far remote from prejudice he is against Catholics, or how extremely solicitous he is in the conversion of Catholics by such a specimen of his benignity. He may continue, but it will not serve to persuade any unprejudiced Protestant in this company that it has anything at all to do with the fundamental articles of our holy religion. But, being conversant in history, I find that it is impossible to decide who were the more cruel during those disastrous civil wars, the Catholics or Protestants. Whoever looks at Bossuet's history with attention, a book replete with testimony on the subject, will find that the Hugonots, of the two, were the more infuriate set than those who were called the Catholics of the day. Those Catholics, as they were called, who perpetrated all those atrocities of St. Bartholomew, were actually the same atheistical characters who filled all France, within our own memory, with the blood of the priests. I repeat it therefore, again and again, In these scenes of blood and horror the Hugonots set the example. Every true Catholic de-

precates, and ever will, such a system as this; and therefore, my friends, the assertion of my friend is a most deliberate calumny, that has no foundation whatever. But after all, my friends, what have these shuddering horrors of state policy to do with the subject? For my part, gentlemen, I am more horror-struck at a Reformer like Calvin burning Servetus at the stake—a man pretended to be raised up by God to reform and humanize mankind, who burns, atrociously burns Servetus at the stake, for differing with him on points of religion—I am more horror-struck, I say, at the atrocious premeditated villany of Calvin's dark-brooding mind, than at the wild rush to massacre of an ignorant, deluded, and craftily-incited populace.

Is it not recorded in the life of Knox, lately published by Macree, that in a conversation with Maitland, the following argument took place?—

“Maitland challenged his opponent, John Knox, to prove that the apostles or prophets ever taught that subjects ought to suppress the idolatry of their rulers. Knox appealed to the conduct of one prophet, Elisha, in anointing Jehu, and giving him a charge to punish the idolatry and bloodshed of the royal family of Ahab. ‘Jehu was a king before he put anything in execution,’ said the secretary.

“‘My lord, he was a mere subject, and no king, when one prophet's servant came to him;—’ &c.

“‘Besides this,’ said Maitland, ‘the fact is extraordinary, and ought not to be imitated.’

“‘It had the ground of God's ordinary judgment, which commands the idolater to die the death,’ answered Knox.”—*Knox*, vol. ii. pp. 127, 8, 9.

But, gentlemen, let me make one

observation more on my learned friend's procedure in thus introducing in polemical discussion the massacre of St. Bartholomew. My friend, who has exhausted all his eloquence in describing that abominable transaction, seems to imagine, and to impress upon you, that not a single feature of iniquity was wanting to complete that diabolical picture. But I maintain that there was; I maintain that the mound of horrors would on that day have been heaped up to a far more enormous height, had my learned friend been able, with the pen of truth in his hand, to describe the blood-stained band of ruffians that flew about the streets of Paris, to describe them, I say, with the poniard in one hand, and the Bible in the other, to justify their sanguinary deeds.

No, gentlemen, a scene of such complicated, such hypocritical, such sacrilegious villany, remained for the Scotch Calvinist to exemplify; and, in my humble opinion, there are not wanting those who would gladly seize an opportunity of acting up to it, in its full tide of horrors, at the present day. [Sensation.]

Gentlemen, I really shall be as great a Rambler in my discussion as my learned friend, who so frequently accuses me of wandering, and not following him. But I must inform him, at once, that I do not intend to do it; indeed I cannot find time to answer all these notes, having matter before me much more serious and important. There is one subject, however, dwelt upon by my learned antagonist with such vehemence, that I must advert to it. It is with reference to the fear of hell.

I do maintain, notwithstanding those gentlemen who laughed so heartily on a previous occasion—I certainly do maintain that he who fears hell fears God. For what is

hell, I ask, but an abode of torments, lighted up by the fires of an avenging God? Is it too much to say that the fear of hell is the fear of God? The Catholic Church has said many persons are afraid to go to confession because they think they have not a sincere conversion; and it is laid down as an article of faith in the Council of Trent, that after having endeavoured to excite contrition by prayer, you must not return from the tribunal of confession under a false idea that you have not a true contrition; you must pray to God, and do your utmost to excite a genuine contrition, and when you have done your utmost to bring about a true contrition, and confessed your sins, then you are entitled to full absolution. That is the doctrine of the Church, and, whether right or wrong, that is a matter of opinion for my friend and me. I abide by the decision of the Church, and still maintain, notwithstanding the calumnies of my learned friend and his myrmidons, I do most strenuously maintain that he that fears hell fears God, or he would not fear hell at all; and that the fear of God is, as we find in the inspired book of Proverbs, the beginning of wisdom.

Again, I read in the Protestant version of the 13th Psalm, ver. 4: "But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared."

Now, if that version be correct, and from the Hebrew it undoubtedly is, though not from the more correct *Septuagint*, I conclude that forgiveness is granted in order that *fear* may ensue, and, consequently, in that *fear* I must of necessity include *love*, *fear* being the *primum mobile*.

Whoever fears God, must necessarily believe him to exist, and to be the foundation of all good; and he who is impressed with such an idea

must necessarily love. If he did not, *fear* would be taken away from him by its donor, and consequently *love* there would be none.

As to relics—the next note taken from the ramblings of my argumentative speechifier—the *superstitious* veneration of relics,—I know nothing of it, I never countenanced it; it is no article of my faith to be superstitious. I revere relics, I cherish them; but mark me, friends, *not superstitiously*—not imagining that the touch of a relic can do away with the pollution of a sin.

If it is a fault, it springs from devotion, and not from impiety. I will say, moreover, that it ill becomes Protestants in this country to charge us with superstition, where such an excessive veneration has been exhibited for certain illustrious rangers, after their departure from this earth, insomuch that one of the garments of Huntingdon, which I need not name or specify to this assembly, was actually sold for 700*l.* at a public sale; and one might go still further. I will call my friend's attention to Johanna Southcote, who uniformly through life professed herself a staunch member of the Church of England. Does my learned friend forget the excessive veneration paid to every little relic of that Bible-reading lady—to the cradle for rocking, down to the ladle for the feeding of the babe? [Laughter.] Does he forget, I say, the excessive veneration paid to every little relic by the followers of Johanna Southcote, true member of the Church of England? Dr. Ashe, of Winchester, one of the most learned men amongst the theologians of Winchester, a man grown hoary in Biblical literature, a profound Hebraist in the bargain, actually endeavoured to persuade me to purchase a ticket of Johanna Southcote for half-a-guinea, without

which, he assured me, shaking his head most gravely, that it was his firm conviction I should never enter the realms of bliss! [Laughter.] But what, after all, you may say, has this to do with the subject in discussion? A great deal, I reply, when my learned friend is perpetually identifying with the discussion things the most unalliable to it.

But, my friends, I wish to come to the subject—the great subject. My learned friend having laid down with great pomp, and solemnity, and ostentation, his Bible on the table, as his Rule of Faith, I wish to put one more question to him this evening. I wish to give him still further scope for his unbounded ingenuity and his exhaustless store of words. I wish to ask him whether that Bible can inform him whether there is some part of it wanting? I wish to ask the learned gentleman if he ever observed any deficiency in his English Protestant Bible; if in the Psalms he ever noticed the omission of four verses; if he ever noticed that they are struck away? If he cannot, his Bible is not a very loud speaking Bible. It ought to have told him long ago, being his Rule of Faith. Now it is the 14th Psalm I allude to, and I wish to ask my learned friend to turn to the 14th Psalm, and verse 5th, “Their throat is an open sepulchre,” and in the 6th, “Their mouth is full of cursing,” and in the 7th, “Destruction and unhappiness.”

Now [turning to Mr. Cumming, for whom some one, it appears, was looking for the reference] I should like the learned gentleman to find out this himself, and have no prompter or assistance on this subject. The learned gentleman says his Bible *speaks*; let us hear it. [Laughter.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—[Turning to Mr. French.]—What is it you

want?—Give the reference, if you please?

Mr. FRENCH.—[In reply.]—I want you to give me what your Bible says.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I can't tell you anything about it, till you give the reference.

Mr. FRENCH.—It is the 14th Psalm.

Now, gentlemen, I can tell him that it is not in his Bible, and it ought to be there. We have it in our Catholic Bible, we have it in the Septuagint, from which we all know St. Paul quoted. We have, therefore, a complete Bible; you have not. Now how comes this? Will my friend deny it? I ask my friend whether he will deny that it ought to be in the Bible? [A pause.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—They *are* in the Bible. [Turning to Mr. French.]

Mr. FRENCH.—Yes! they are in the Bible—in *our* Bible.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Will you have the goodness to read, or I will read for you. [The rev. gentleman was about to begin, when—]

Mr. FRENCH said:—No! no! in the *ancient* Bible; I don't want you to read it from the Epistle to the Romans. I want to know where it is in the *original* Psalms?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It is in the Bible.

Mr. FRENCH.—Yes, it is in the Bible. We have it in our Catholic Bible in its proper place, and St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, quotes from the Bible, and we have it in and from the Bible, but you have not. Of course you have it in Paul's Epistle, but why is it not in the place from whence he quotes it? “As it is written,” says St. Paul, (iii. 10)—“as it is written There is none righteous, no not one; there is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God,” and so on he goes. There-

fore most evidently you have a spurious Bible. [A pause.]

Rev. J. CUMMING [turning to Mr. French.].—It is here in the Psalms; it is here in the 5th [pointing thereto.]

Mr. FRENCH [quickly.] — No, no, no.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—I will read it—"For there is no faithfulness in their mouth; their inward part is very wickedness; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongues."

Mr. FRENCH.—No; I asked for Psalm 14th.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It's in the 5th.

Mr. FRENCH.—Why isn't it in *its place*, where it is in ours?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It's in the Book of Psalms; and in the 5th Psalm.

Mr. FRENCH.—Well, it's not in its right place.

Rev. J. CUMMING.—It is :—here [pointing to the Bible] in the Psalms.

[Much laughter was occasioned here, by these quick retorts on either side. Order restored, the learned gentleman thus continued :.]—I wish thus to show you, my friends, [turning to the audience] what parts of your Bible are wanting; but, as I am reminded that my time is precious, I must defer that task. I shall only observe at present that the task which I impose upon my friend is of a gigantic nature: it is to exculpate the perverters of the Gospel from the charge of sacrilege—from the imprecations heaped upon the head of him who sits down voluntarily to vitiate the sacred fountains of revealed truth: that is the task I impose upon him, and I defy him, with all the powers of his oratory, to do it. No, my friends, the translators of his Bible stand convicted. My words will appear on paper, and they will outweigh all his flimsy, superficial arguments, endeavouring to extenuate

their crimes. The crime is deep; there is none of a more guilty nature than that of deliberately altering the law of God in order to impose upon the population of this country. You have been deceived, my friends, by wicked men, who have altered the Bible in order to poison you.

And now, gentlemen, let me make an apology to the Protestant part of my audience, and to my learned friend. I have ridiculed a great deal the idea of that sweet and glorious unity which has been panegyricized in so glowing a manner by my learned friend, and have endeavoured certainly to make it a subject of obloquy and ridicule. It is never too late, my friends, to make an apology, and I most sincerely make it this evening, because I find one point wherein there is the most perfect equanimity and concord. I find, on looking at the period of the Reformation in this country, a perfect agreement at the blessed period of the Reformation, when there was such an effusion, as some men have said, such an effusion of God's Spirit upon happy, glorious England. The first author I shall allude to is *Father Latimer*. You have heard one of the sentiments of Father Latimer with regard to the sufferings of our Saviour. The book from which I am about to quote is entitled "Fruitful Sermons preached by the Right Reverend Hugh Latimer. London, 1584." He witnessed the blessed effects of the Reformation.

He says, page 84, Sermon 7th:—"I never saw surely so little discipline as is now-a-days. Men will be masters; they be masters and no less disciples. Alas, where is this discipline now in England? The people regard no discipline, they will be without all order. Men, the more they know, the worse they be. It is truly said, *scientia inflat*, knowledge maketh

proud, and causes us to forget all, and set away discipline. — SURELY IN POPERY THEY HAD A REVERENCE, BUT NOW WE HAVE NONE AT ALL; I NEVER SAW THE LIKE. We continually blaspheme Christ's passion, in hawking, hunting, dicing and carding."—p. 84.

Sofar Father Latimer. [Laughter.] Now to Father Luther!

Martin Luther, Sermon in Portel. Evang. i. Adv.—

"The world grows every day worse and worse. It is plain that men are much more covetous, malicious, resentful, much more unruly, shameless, and full of vice, than they were in the time of Popery.

"Formerly when we were seduced by the Pope, men willingly followed good works, but now all their study is to get every thing for themselves, by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury."

Luth. Sermon Dom. 26 post Trin.

"It is a wonderful thing, and full of scandal, that from the time when the pure doctrine arose, the world should daily grow worse and worse."—*Luther in Sermon Conver.*

Now come we to that Protestant luminary, the great Bucer, the second patriarch of the Reformation:—

"The greater part of the people (says he) seem only to have embraced the Gospel in order to shake off the yoke of discipline, and the obligation of fasting, penance, &c. which lay upon them in the time of Popery, and to live at their pleasure, enjoying their lust and lawless appetites without control. They, therefore, lend a willing ear to the doctrine that we are justified by faith alone, and not by good works, having no relish for them."—*De Regn. Christi*, l. i. c. 4.

And now to Calvin himself!!!

Calvin, l. 6, *de Scand.* :—

"Of so many thousands seem-

ingly eager on embracing the Gospel, how few have since amended their lives! Nay, what else does the greater part pretend, than, by shaking off the yoke of superstition, to launch out more freely into every kind of lasciviousness—ut excusso servitutis jugo in omnem lasciviam diffuerent?"

Listen also to Erasmus, their contemporary, for on this point Catholics and Protestants agree:—

"Take notice of these evangelical people, and show me an individual amongst them *all*, who from a drunkard has become sober, from being a libertine has become chaste. I, on the other hand, can show you many who have become worse by the change."—*Erasm. Spond. advers. Hutten*, A.D. 1529.

"Those whom I knew to be chaste, sincere, and without fraud, I found, after they had embraced this sect, to be licentious in their conversation, gamblers, neglectful of prayer, passionate, vain, as spiteful as serpents, and lost to the feelings of human nature."—*Erasm. ad fratri inferior. Germanæ.*

"What an evangelical generation is this? Nothing was ever seen more licentious; nothing is less evangelical than these pretended gospellers."—*Erasm. Epis.* l, vi. 4.

Hear also Protestant Stubbs's Motives to Good Works, with an Epistle Dedicatory to the Lord Mayor of London:—

"For good works, who sees not that *they*, (*the Papists*,) of former times were far beyond us, and we far behind them?"

I wonder my learned antagonist has ceased asking for the page and title of the books, &c. from whence I make these pleasant extracts!—[laughter]—but *I* have not yet had a sufficiency of them, however satiated my learned friend may be.

Let us go back again to our sweet little Calvin. [Laughter.]

Calvin to Melancthon. — Epistola ad Melancth. p. 145.

“It is of great importance that there should not be transmitted to future ages any suspicion of the divisions that exist amongst us, for it is beyond imagination ridiculous that, after having quarrelled with all the world, we should agree so little amongst ourselves.”

Well, we will go on to Luther!

Luther contra Zuinglium et Ecolampadium, l. i.

“If the world is to last much longer, I do declare, considering all these different interpretations of the Scriptures, that there is no other means remaining for us to preserve the unity of the faith, than that of receiving the decrees of the Council, and taking refuge under her authority.”

And, my friends, if you doubt Luther and Calvin, hear Beza.

Protestant Beza, in his Theological Epistle, p. 13.

“What is their opinion in Belgium to-day you may perhaps ascertain, but what it will be to-morrow it is impossible to conjecture. In what, I pray, do all those agree who make war upon the Roman Pontiff? Run over all their articles from the first to the last, and you will see nothing advanced by one of her teachers but it is immediately exclaimed against by another as an impiety. . . . They make themselves a new creed every month—*menstruam fidem habent.*”

Now, let us listen to another great Protestant writer, George Major. Another Protestant authority says, on the confusion of dogmas:—

“The Papists object to us our dissensions. I confess we cannot sufficiently deplore them: I confess, also, that the simple are troubled

at them, so far as no longer to know where is the truth, and whether there still remains for God a Church on earth.”

Listen also to a very pithy observation of the celebrated Melancthon, corroborative of that sweet unity subsisting among Protestants!—*Melancthon, Theolog. p. 249.*

“Nothing brings so much discredit on the Gospel as our mutual dissensions.”

Nay, my friends, Luther himself thus writes:—

“Whilst a Catholic I passed my life in austerities, in watchings and praying, in poverty, chastity and obedience.”—*Luth. tom. v. chap. i. ad Galat. v. xiv.*

But let us hear Calvin once more upon this blessed Reformation, when the effusion of the Holy Spirit was so unboundedly copious:—

“Of the greater part of those who betake themselves to the Gospel, what other intention had they than nisi ut excusso superstitionis jugo, solutius in omnem lasciviam diffuerent?” that is, “that, having shaken off the yoke of superstition, they might more dissolutely plunge themselves into all riot and lasciviousness?”—*Calvin, Bib. de Scandalis, p. 118 and 127.*

Smidden, the Protestant, says, “That the world may know they are no Papists, and they do not trust in good works, not one will they put in practice. Instead of being more bountiful to the poor, they unfleece and flay them. Prayers they turn to oaths, &c.”—*Smidelinus, conc. 4, Super c. ii. Luc. conc. 1 Super c. xxi.*

Protestant Spangeberg says, “Post revelatum evangelium, et rejectum pontificatum evasisse homines adeo feras, ut Deum non agnoscant, nec ullam ejus rei rationem habeant; velintque rectum et justum sit quidquid unicuique

visum fuerit." The translation of which is, "After they had cast off the papacy, men became so wild that they acknowledged not God, nor stood in the least awe of him, but considered every thing to be right and lawful which suited their respective interests."

Protestant Castalion, who resided at Geneva, and was the most intimate friend of Beza, of its inhabitants says, "They are so proud and puffed with vainglory and revenge, that with less danger you might offend princes than exasperate any of these proud Calvinists. Their life is infamous and villanous. They are masters of arts in reproaches, lies, cruelty, treason, and insupportable arrogance. They name their Geneva their *Holy City*, and their assembly *Jerusalem*. But in very truth, we should call it, 'Oh, Babylon, Babylon! Oh, Egypt, and true frontiers of Egyptian and Babylonian enchanters! Oh, most infamous Sodom and children of Gomorrah.'"—*Castal. apud Rescium*, p. 54.

Protestant Schlusselfburg tells us that Beza, "not in the time of his *Papistry*, but ever after, throughout his whole life, employed himself wholly gratifying his lusts, writing his loves, and revenging himself on his rivals."—*Schlusselfburg*, lib. i. fol. 92 and 93; lib. ii. art. 1; lib. iii. art. 8.

The Calvinist Meno says, "I have ascertained, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that they are without the spirit, mission, and word of Christ; that, by their teaching and works, they hunt only after the favour of men, honours, pride, revenues, goodly buildings, and looseness of life."—*Meno in fundament. de doctrin. prædicat.*

Secondly, hear Calvin himself giving an account of the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the minds

of men in the centre of orthodoxy. Geneva, at the dawn of the *blessed Reformation*, that most propitious of all SEASONS FOR EXHIBITING IN ITS FAIREST LIGHT THE GATHERING UP OF THE GLORIOUS INSPIRATION OF PROTESTANTISM—namely, when the apostolic Reformers were living among them, and breathing, no doubt, at every step they took through life, the true spirit of celestial piety. The words of Calvin are these, and who could believe it possible, unless he heard them?—"The ministers of Geneva, as empty bellies give up to all idleness, provided they are left unmolested in the enjoyment of their delights, are totally unsollicitous as to heaven or earth, whether they are confounded together or not."—*Calv. in Tract. p. 140, et Epist. 54, et lib. de Scandal. p. 131.*

Of *Ecolampadius*, *Carolostadius*, and *Bucer*, their brethren themselves confess that they were in the end smothered by devils.—*Vide Luther de Missa Privata*, and *Schlusselfburg, in Catal. Hæret. lib. i. p. 4.*

Calvin in Præf. Nov. Testam. Gallica, A.D. 1567:—

"Satan hath gained more by these new interpreters than he did before by keeping the word from the people."

Sturmius de ratione contradict. ineundæ, page 24:—"Lutherani libros publica editis, ecclesias Anglicanas, Gallicas, Belgicas, Scotticas, Helveticas, tanquam hæreticas, condemnant eorum martyres, martyres diaboli vocant."

"The Lutherans in their public books condemn the Churches of England, France, Flanders, Scotland, Switzerland; they call their martyrs, martyrs of the devil."

Again:—"Quod scribunt Zuinigliani se à nobis pro fratribus agnitos, illud tam impudenter, tanta-

que vanitate ab illis confectum est, ut eorum impudentiam mirari satis nequeamus. Nos vero ut in ecclesiâ locum illis nullum concedimus ita etiam pro fratribus minus agnoscimus, quos spiritu mendacii agitari deprehendimus, et in filium hominis contumeliosos esse: "What the Zuinglians write, that they by us are accounted brethren, that is so impudently and vainly forged by them, that we cannot sufficiently admire their impudence. For we, as we account them not in the Church, so also do we as little repute them our brethren, whom we find under the influence of the spirit of falsehood, and to be contumelious against the Son of God."—*Epitome Colloq. Maulbrune, A.D. 1564, p. 82.*

"The Lutherans, on their part, were not slow in requiting the Calvinists. They answer by Schlussemburg."—*Theol. Calv. 13 and 6.*

"Quod Calvinistæ nos Lutheranos volunt habere pro fratribus, quos tamen ut hæreticos damnant."

"So between them (says John Jesler) Litigandi, scribendi, declamandi, disputandi, condemnandi, excommunicandi, inter Lutheranos et Calvinistas, nullus est finis." That is, "There is no end of chiding, writing, accusing, disputing, condemning, excommunicating, between Lutherans and Calvinists."—*John Jesler, Zuinglio Calvinista, L. de diurne Belli Eucharistici, pp. 25, 80.*

Nicholas Gallus.—"Non sunt utique parva certamina inter nos, neque de minutis rebus, sed de sublimibus articulis Christianæ doctrinæ, de lege et evangelio, de justificatione, et bonis operibus, de sacramentis, et cæremoniæ usu; quæ nullo pacto componi, vel reticere aut dissimulari possunt. SUNT ENIM MERÆ CONTRADICTIONES, quæ concordiam non ferunt."

"Certainly they are not small contentions that are amongst us, nor trifles, but concerning the most momentous articles of the Christian religion; of the law and gospel, of justification and good works, of sacraments and use of ceremonies, which by no means can be appeased, hidden or dissembled. For they are plain contradictions which cannot be reconciled."—*Nicholas Gallus, Superintendens Ratisbonæ in thesibus ac hypothesibus.*

Is not this, let me ask, my friends, without the trouble of racking and torturing thieves and impostors, to have them falling out among themselves, and good men to come by their goods—that is, the true Church to be verified? Is not this to have falsehood unhooded and truth revealed? to have disagreement convicted, and the kingdom thereby known to be satanical?

Luther Figurini in præf. Apologetica Orthodoxi consensus:—

"Quænam quæso, per Deum immortalem, potest iniri concordia cum Calvinistis, qui ipsum Filium Dei mendacii argument?"

"What concord, I pray you in God's name, can be established with the Calvinists, who give the lie to the Son of God?"

Oh, my Catholic and Protestant friends! is it not time, think ye, to exclaim in the language of St. Augustine, *Tract 33 in Johann. :—*

"Credamus, fratres, quantum quisque amat ecclesiam, tantum habet et Spiritum Sanctum."

"Let us believe, my friends, that so much as a man loveth the Church, so much he hath of the Holy Ghost."

But now, gentlemen, having presented this blooming little nosegay to my learned friend, to recreate, if possible, his exhausted spirits, proceed we to other matter; only let

me observe, *en passant*, that it will be a long time, in my humble opinion, before he will have the conscience, or at least the effrontery, in any of his future addresses to you, to cant about the *Blessed Reformation!!!*

My learned antagonist, having occupied his hour in declaiming against almost every article of our religion, and reviving subjects already most amply discussed by him and me, I think it but fair that I should have some advantage allowed me in referring to a subject not immediately under discussion. My friend has once more adverted to the doctrine of Transubstantiation this evening, though I thought that subject had been satisfactorily settled; at least I am perfectly convinced that what has already appeared upon paper (*i.e.* printed report) will for ever persuade all impartial persons that, from the very outset of Christianity, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was believed and diffused throughout all Christendom. Does my learned friend forget, that in the beginning, the very first father of the Church tells us that there were certain heretics who absented themselves from the Eucharist, because they would not make up their minds to believe in it?

But hear his own words:—

“They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in his goodness resuscitated. These, therefore, contradicting this gift of God, die in their investigations.”—*St. Ignat. ad Smyrnæos, Ep. p. 4, ed. Pearsoni et Smithii, Oxon. 1079.*

You recollect, my friends, how confounded my antagonist appeared when he heard the words; you re-

collect his puerile attempt at annihilating their force, by referring me to a passage in the same father, in his Epistle to the Romans, where, speaking of the Eucharist, he says, “I desire the drink of God, *his blood*, which is *love* incorruptible and eternal life.”—*St. Ign. Ep. ad Rom. p. 29, Patr. Apostol. Amstelod. 1724.*

And, above all, my friends, you recollect the crushing, overwhelming answer I gave to his vain subterfuge, namely, “*If the flesh of Christ is to cease to be flesh, because St. Ignatius calls the Eucharist love incorruptible and eternal life*, God himself, by a parity of reasoning, is to resolve *into mere love*, since St. John the Evangelist says, ‘*God is love.*’”—*St. John Epist. c. 4. v. 16.*

Again, I ask my friend, whether “which flesh the Father in his goodness resuscitated” meant *bread*? [Sensation.] Surely my friend can answer that satisfactorily? Then again, St. Austin tells me it is the real flesh of our Saviour. But my friend is taking advantage of the abstract passage without reading the rest of it. Again, when my learned antagonist brought St. Augustine on the arena, to assist him, why did not he himself act like a fair combatant, and give us all that St. Augustine said illustrative of the subject, in the same pages whence he made the extract which he imagined would appal me? I admit the passage of my antagonist to have been fairly quoted; the unfairness consisted in suppressing the sequel.

The passage runs thus:—

“*Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti.—Why do you prepare your teeth and stomach? Believe and you have eaten.*”

But what immediately follows, my friends? Listen! Why these illuminating sentences:—

"Faith indeed is discriminated from works, according to what the apostle said, that man is justified by faith without the works of the law."

"Ideo noluit discernere ab opere fidem, sed ipsum fidem dixit esse opus."

"His (the apostle's) meaning, therefore, was not to separate faith from works, but faith itself he said was a work."

"Ille (Moyses) plenum ventrem promittebat in terra, sed cibo qui perit; iste promittebat cibum, non qui perit, sed qui permanet in æternum. Non ergo Moyses dedit panem de cœlo. Deus dat panem. Sed quem panem? forte mannæ? Non, sed panem quem significavit manna, ipsum scilicet Dominum Jesum."

"He (Moses) promised a full belly on earth, but consisting of perishable food; the former (Christ) promised food, not of a perishable, but of an eternal nature. It was not Moses that gave the bread from heaven. God gives that bread. But what bread? Perhaps you will say the manna? No; but the bread which was signified by the manna, to wit, THE LORD JESUS HIMSELF."—*St. Aug. v. iii. p. 490. Pars Secunda.*

No wonder, then, my friends, St. Augustine having thus plainly told us what the sacrament consists of, that he should exclaim with holy rapture in alluding to it, "O sacramentum pietatis, O signum unitatis, O vinculum caritatis! qui vult vivere, habet unde vivat, accedat, credat, incorporetur, ut vivificetur."—*P. 460, v. iii. p. sec.*

"Oh sacrament of piety! Oh sign of unity! Oh bond of charity! He who wishes to live has wherewithal to live, has whereupon to live. Let him approach, let him believe, let him be incorporated, in order that he may be quickened with life!"

"Accedat credat," says St. Augustine, that is "let him approach, let him believe," so that you see plainly, contrary to the inculcation of my reverend antagonist, "believing without approaching" will not do. The "os fidele" must be joined to the "cor fidele," to use the saint's own words; that is, "with faithful mouth and heart."

Again, I ask, *Incorporated* with what? Where is the subject of incorporation? My friend, if he be consistent, must say, in contradiction to St. Augustine, "Non cum ipso Domino Jesu." Not certainly *with the Lord Jesus himself!*

But St. Augustine is not yet satisfied with his endeavours to clear the subject from all possibility of doubt. He goes on in the same page to stagger my learned antagonist still more visibly. [Laughter.]

"Quod autem ad invicem litigantes quærunt, quomodo possit Dominus carnem suam dare ad manducandum, non statim audiunt; sed adhuc eis dicitur, Amen, amen dico vobis, Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Quomodo quidem edeatur, et quisnam modus sit manducandi istum panem, ignoratus; verumtamen nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis."—*St. Aug. in Joan. Tract 27. cap. vi.*

"But as to their litigating together in their mutual inquiries, 'How can the Lord give us his flesh to eat?' they do not immediately hear it (the solution); but as yet it is said to them, '*Verily, verily*, I say unto you, Unless ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you.' How indeed is he eaten, and what is the mode of eating that bread, ye are ignorant. However, unless ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of

Man, and shall drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you."

In one word, my friends, If ye wish to eat the bread in the same mode as St. Augustine ate, ye must believe it to be *the very flesh of Jesus Christ*, and ye *sin if ye adore it not before ye eat it*. These are the very words of St. Augustine. Now, my reverend antagonist, spurning as he does this doctrine, and disdaining to adore it before reception, is not, most indubitably, of the same faith with St. Augustine; whereas I, receiving it in the self-same manner, am most indubitably a member of the self-same faith with that illustrious father. Let my opponent put his extract with the rest which I have cited, and then tell us therefrom what St. Austin is inculcating. St. Austin is inculcating, and my friend knows it well, that we are not to take the sacrament as the Caernaites took it. My friend knows, if he has ever read and pondered on ecclesiastical history, that they maintained that it was real pieces of flesh, and real drops of blood they took in the sacrament; and St. Austin wishes to disprove and extinguish such a heresy, and he is pointing out the mode in which it is to be received.

When I find, then, Augustine "prostrate (as my friend would say) at his idolatry" in adoring the sacrament, can I doubt what his meaning is? He (Mr. Cumming) tells me that the Spirit effects it; that it is a figure. Certainly, we are not sensible of eating the body of our Lord when we take it. That there is something figurative in it Augustine inculcates; and all that we can do is, not to think as the Caernaites did, that it was flesh and blood, but to meditate sweetly on his passion, on his sufferings, whilst the priest is giving us his flesh to eat and his blood to drink.

That is what Augustine inculcates, together with a whole host of fathers, but Augustine in particular—all the fathers telling us that it is Christ's real body and blood, animated by his soul and his divinity, and that unless we take it in that manner we have no life within us; and still most preposterously will he (Mr. Cumming) maintain that it is not Christ's body, but a real figure. Why, just as well might that sect called the Gnostics, in the beginning of Christianity, maintain that Christ was but a figure on earth—no real body—an aerial being; that he moved about and spoke, and conversed and laid down his precepts, and was fixed to the cross, but that, nevertheless, by some supernatural wonder, he had no flesh and no blood; denying indeed, as they did, that Christ had flesh when living, they naturally enough refused to believe that flesh could be in the sacrament. "The flesh," they exclaimed, "says Christ himself, 'profiteth nothing,' and my reverend antagonist quotes the same saying in support of his error, that which the Gnostics quoted to give plausibility to theirs.

Again, my friends, I proved the verity of our sacrament by words of Scripture, from the 13th Acts, ver. 2.—*λείτουργοῦντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ νηστευόντων*, which I translate with Erasmus, "Whilst they were sacrificing to the Lord and fasting," meant sacrament. I proved it by the authority of Erasmus; I proved it by the authority of two Greek lexicographers, whose lexicons were written by Greeks during the time that that language was spoken on earth, namely, Suidas and Hesychius, the former actually interpreting the word *λείτουργία* by *sacrifice*. I proved it by the unanimous voice of the whole Greek Church, who use, to this very day,

the word *λειτουργία* for *mass*; and, wherever the mass is said in Greek, the word for *to celebrate mass* is *λειτουργεῖν*, or *ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν λειτουργίαν*. What can be more positive, therefore, than that this was meant to be inculcated by the apostle, and transmitted to us by tradition—the consecration of the body and blood of our Lord constituting the sacrifice called the mass, which is found so undeniably and plainly stamped in the pages of the Gospel? Can anything be clearer or more conclusive? Besides, the clear word used in the Gospel for ministering is uniformly *διακόνειν*, as in Matt. iv.—“καὶ ἰδὸν ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.” “And behold, angels came and ministered unto him.”

Again, in Luke viii. v. 3:—

“καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαὶ αἰτίνες διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.” “And many others which ministered unto him of their substance.”

The use, therefore of the word *λειτουργοῦντων* in the Acts, sets the question between us and Protestants at rest for ever.

Again, I prove it from Theodoretus. Listen, my friends, for it most completely terminates the dispute between us:—

“If the priest who is according to the law have ended, and the priest who is according to the order of Melchizedek has offered sacrifice, and all see that other sacrifices be not necessary, why do the priests of the New Testament perform the mystic *liturgy*?” that is, *sacrifice*.—Theodor. in. c. x. Ep. ad Hebræ.

The Greek words are, for “Why do the priests of the New Testament perform the mystic liturgy or testament?”—*τι δὴποτε τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης οἱ ἱερεῖς τὴν μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελλούσιν*; where you observe not only is the word

λειτουργίαν used for *sacrifice*, but the word *ἱερεῖς* for *sacrificing priest*!

My learned antagonist, you may remember, told us that *ἱερεὺς* meant *sacrificing priest*, and that it never occurred as applied to minister in the New Testament. But let my friend remember that *λειτουργός* does occur, and that is precisely the same thing. In proof, open Hesychius—you have the same interpretation of *λειτουργίας* by *ἱεράτικας*.

Nay, Suidas tells us that the primary meaning of the word *λειτουργία* is “the functions of a sacrificing priest.”

His words are, and I transcribed them this morning from his lexicon, *λειτουργία, κυρίως μὲν ἱερατικῇ, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ ἡ δουλικῇ*.” And, my friends, if you will not believe us Catholics when we assure you that this sacrifice has been offered up in every age at the altar of true Christians, listen to one of your learned and renowned bishops, namely, Bishop Forbes:—“The holy fathers constantly say, that in the Eucharist is offered and *sacrificed the very body of Christ*.”

Listen, again, to that profoundly learned Protestant divine, whose bust stares you in the face the moment you enter Westminster Abbey:—Dr. Grabbe!

“It is certain that Irenæus, with all the fathers, either cotemporary with the apostles or their successors, did consider the Eucharist as *the sacrifice of the new law*; and that this was not the private opinion of any one church, but *the public doctrine of the universal Church, received from Christ*.”

But, gentlemen, the words of your Bishop Parker are most remarkable; they are as follow:—

“No Protestant should refuse assent to the doctrine of transubstantiation for the incredibility of the thing, when he himself professes

to believe that of the incarnation. If transubstantiation be a piece of folly, it is a most ancient one in the Church. St. Paul, St. Ignatius the Martyr, St. Irenæus, &c. speak of it exactly as the Catholics do at this day."—*Bishop Parker's Critical History of the Bible*, p. 276.

Bishop Parker's "Reasons for Abrogating the Test," p. 13:—

"It is evident to all men, that the ancient fathers, from age to age, asserted the real and *substantial* presence in very high and expressive terms."

"*Conversion, transmutation, transformation, transfiguration, trans-
elementation, and at length transubstantiation.* By all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real* and substantial presence in the Eucharist."—*Idem*, p. 46.

As for the Church of England, she agrees with the tradition of the Roman and Reformed Churches, in asserting the certainty of the real presence, and the uncertainty of the manner.

Protestant Pocklington's "Altare Christianum," p. 130:—

"If there be no Christian sacrifice, there is no Christian priest. If there be no Christian priest, then away with our Book of Ordination."

My reverend opponent says there is no Christian priest, and crushes with his foot, as far as he can do it, his loving sister's Church of England. What spectacle is this, my friends, in this assembly? Quick, my friends, let the Calvinists go to one side of the room, and the Church of England men to another. They are at deadly war, at daggers drawn. And now, my friends, let me solace my downcast friend and antagonist by a few more quotations from eminent Protestant divines, confirmatory of our various tenets—Purgatory, Tradition, Primacy of St. Peter, &c. &c. &c., having first

premised to my learned friend, who denies the doctrine of tradition, that Bossuet, in his celebrated conference with Claude, which produced the conversion of Mademoiselle Duras, obliged him to confess that, by the "Protestant Rule," every artisan and husbandman may and ought to believe that they can understand the Scripture better than all the fathers of the Church, ancient and modern, put together.

Bishop Forbes on Purgatory.

"Let not the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead be any longer rejected by Protestants, as it is a practice received throughout the universal Church, which did ever believe it both pious and charitable. Many of the fathers believed that *light sins* were forgiven after death, and it is no absurdity to think so; in truth, the custom of praying for the departed comes, as Chrysostom says, from the apostles."

Protestant Tradition.—Dr. Brett's "Tradition Necessary," p. 73.

"It is evident from the Scriptures themselves that the whole of Christianity was first delivered to the bishops succeeding the apostles by oral tradition, and they were also commanded to keep it, and deliver it to their successors in like manner. Nor is it anywhere found in Scripture, by St. Paul or any other apostle, that they would either jointly or separately *write down*."

Speaking of the 2d Thessalonians v. 6, pp. 32, 33,

"Here," says he, "we see plain mention of *St. Paul's traditions*, delivered by word of mouth, as well as by *writing*, and a condemnation of those who do not equally observe both."

Montague's "Gagger Gagged," pp. 20, 41—"Traditions instituted by Christ in points of faith have

divine authority as the written word hath. Traditions from the apostles have equal authority with their writings; and *no* Protestant in his senses will deny that the apostles spoke *much more* than is *written*." And mark, my friends, Bishop Montague was a true Church-of-England man, for which reason the Puritans hated him.

Chillingworth's "Safe Way," p. 153:—"The controversy as to which Scripture is canonical may be decided by tradition, which is a rule to judge all controversies by."

This work of Chillingworth was composed for the express purpose of proving the Scripture alone to be the sole and only judge whereby all was to be judged. It was upon the spot so irrefragably answered by the Rev. Mr. Knott, in his learned work, "Infidelity Unmasked," that no one, as Protestant Mr. Wood, the author of "Athenæ Oxoniensis," says, ever attempted to defend Chillingworth against him.

"If the Church of Rome be either the Catholic Church or a Catholic Church, then we Protestants cannot justify our separation."—*Hick's Letters to a Popish Priest*, p. 246.

"I confess that it is the temple of God; in which the Pope rules."—*Calvin, on 2 Thess. xi. 4.*

"In the Church of Rome is everything good in Christianity—true baptism, true sacrament of the altar, true keys for the remission of sins, true office of preaching, true catechism, the ten commandments, and all the sacraments. I say, moreover, that Popery is true Christianity, nay, the very kernel of Christianity."—*Luth. Contra Anabaptistas*, tom. xi. *Jerm.* p. 229.

Now, when Papists have the kernel they will not quarrel about the shell, as that excellent controvertist, Mr. William Talbot, has observed before me.

Dr. White's "Defence" of his "Way,"
ch. xxxvii.

"I never denied the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, in which our ancestors held the true Church and were saved."

"We deny not," says Whitaker, "that Peter was the foundation and governor of the Church, and, if required, we will grant that it was promised to him in the text, 'Thou art Peter,' &c."—*Whitaker contra Bellarminum*, Quest. cap. ii. pp. 554, 557, lib. iv. c. 4.

"I grant," says he, "that the keys were promised to *him*, for the text proves it, and I will never deny it."

"Who can deny Peter to have been the rock and foundation of the Church?"—*Contra Duræum*, sect. 4.

"Quis Petrum non fatetur esse Petram et ecclesiæ fundamentum?"

"In reality, the keys were never given by Christ to any one man, but to the Church."—*Quest. 5. cap. iii. p. 602.*

Dr. Dumoulin.—Vocation of Pastors,
pp. 309, 320.

This Dumoulin was prebend of Canterbury, and one of the most learned Protestant divines of the 17th century. He died 1658.

"Whosoever reads the writings of the fathers, will find those of the fourth and fifth ages giving the supremacy to the Bishop of Rome, and asserting that to him belongs the care of all the churches."—*Ibid.*

"Thanks to Dr. Dumoulin, but he might have gone a little higher, as I shall prove."—P. 64, *Kirk. and Berr.—St. Irenæus*, A.D. 177.

The learned Salmasius, Eucharisticon,
p. 644.

"The Bishop of Rome is the great Pontiff, the Father of Fathers, the Ruler and Governor of the universal Church. He is, in fine, the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar

of Christ upon earth,—to express all in one word, the Pope.”

The Protestant Professor Le Fort, of Geneva.

“Most of us have drawn horrible caricatures of the Pope, in the character of Antichrist. These gentlemen are anything but serious in doing so. Nay, I am convinced that there does not exist a single Protestant minister here who would not only leave his Church, but his wife and family, could he but become this dreadful Roman *Antichrist himself!*”

Chillingworth, ch. ii. No. 8.

“When Protestants affirm that the Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith, their meaning is *not* that by *Scripture* all things can be proved; for it can never be proved by Scripture that there is a God, or that the book is the word of God.”

“Chillingworth,” says Dr. Hare, Bishop of Hereford, “was an excellent writer; but what is to be expected of a man who was pushed so home by his adversaries in defence of Protestantism, that he had nothing left but to cry out, ‘The Bible, the Bible, I say, is the religion of Protestants!’ And so say all the heretics that ever existed.”

Preface to Scripture Vindicated, p. 34.

“Were the mere studying the Bible sufficient, not only to convert idolatrous nations, but to make them members of Christ, why were the apostles commanded to go into all the world and to preach the Gospel, when they could have written it in all the languages of the earth, and thus converted the nations by writing?”

The Rev. Mr. O’Callaghan’s Observations on Religious Feeling in Ireland, pp. 1, 2, 11, 92.

“Private judgment in expounding Scripture should be interdicted

as a *dangerous* guide, leading only to public discontent, and spiritual anarchy. It is *disallowed* by the Church of England. The person differing from her is called upon to renounce his *own* opinion, and submit to authority.”

“As to private opinion, it is not improbable that we Irish should be worshippers of Baal, had St. Patrick and his priests relied on the Bible and *private judgment* for our conversion.”

Now, my friends, compare this with the words of another Protestant divine! What a concordia discors!

Dr. Clarke’s Sermon, Dec. 12, 1811.

“I, as a minister of the Church of England, do declare, as soon as it shall be proved, that the distribution of the *Bible alone* is hostile to the Protestant Church, *then* be that Church subverted.”

And here, now I think of it—for I perceive I have marked down a note to recal it to memory—I have the pleasure of informing my learned friend that Duns Scotus, who is one of the jewels embellishing the frontispiece of his (Mr. Cumming’s) little work, that several of his books were condemned as heretical by the Church of Rome, and therefore it is not Catholic authority. However, I should like very much to have the name of the book, and the page of it whence my learned antagonist made that extract from Duns Scotus, as I entertain real doubts as to its existence. [Mr. Cumming here promised to give it on another occasion.] But my learned friend tells me it can be proved by Scripture that Scripture is the word of God. I *deny* it, and shall ever deny it; and the learned gentleman has not sufficient argument to convince me, or any Catholic in the room, that it is so. That Scripture cannot assure us that

itself is canonical Scripture, is acknowledged by several learned Protestants in express words.

Mr. Hooker, the glory of Protestantism, says, "Of all things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what books we are to esteem holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach."—*Hooker, Eccles. Polit.* book i. sec. 14, p. 68.

And this he proves by the same argument which, without borrowing it from him, I have more than once enforced. His words are, "It is not the word of God which doth or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think it is his word. For, if any book of Scripture did give testimony of all, yet still that Scripture which giveth testimony to the rest would require another Scripture to give testimony unto it. Neither could we come to any pause whereon to rest, unless, besides Scripture, there were something which might assure us, &c."—*Ibid.* lib. ii. sec. 4, p. 102.

And this he acknowledges to be the Church.

The Sixth Article—"Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." How then do they prove the procession of the Holy Ghost and Infant Baptism?

Whitaker confesses, that the question concerning canonical Scripture is defined to us, not by *testimony of the private spirit, which, sayeth he, being private and secret, is unfit to teach others, but by the Ecclesiastical Tradition.* "An agreement," says he, "whereby may be argued and convinced, what books be canonical, and what be not."—*Whitak. adv. Stapp.* lib. ii. c. vi. p. 270 to p. 357.

Luther says, "This indeed the Church hath, that she can discern the word of God from the word of men. The Protestant Fulk teaches, *that the Church hath judgment to discern true writings from counterfeit, and the word of God from the writing of men; and that this judgment she hath not of herself, but of the Holy Ghost.*"—Fulk, in his Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic, p. 5.

But let my learned friend, who still inflexibly adheres to the Bible as his Rule of Faith, listen to the first patriarch of Protestants, the immortal Luther, as they call him. Speaking of those who brought in the doctrine of *Anabaptism*, in order that they might despite the Pope, "*Verily,*" says he, "*these men build upon a weak foundation; for, by this means, they ought to deny the whole Scripture and the office of preaching, for all these we have from the Pope; otherwise we must go and make a new Scripture.*"—*Luth. Lib. de Cap. Bab.* c. ii. Witt. fol. 88.

Without the authority, therefore, of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is canonical; which is evident from the circumstance that Protestants cannot agree in assigning the canon of the Holy Scripture. Of the Epistle of James Luther has these words:—"The Epistle of James is contentious, swelling, dry, strawy, and unworthy of an apostolical spirit."—*Luth. Præfat.* in Epist. Jac. in ed. Jen.

And this censure of Luther is acknowledged and maintained by Illiricus.

Chemnitius teaches, that "the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Epistle of Jude, and the Book of Revelations are apocryphal, as not having sufficient testimony to their authority, and therefore that nothing

in controversy can be proved out of these books."—Chemn. in Knchir. p. 65.

The same is taught by many other Lutherans; and if some among them, since the days of Luther, be of a contrary opinion, I wonder what new infallible ground they can allege, that should induce them to differ from their master and so many of the prime and choice of his scholars. I know no better ground than this, namely, that they made use of the same freedom in abandoning him, which he had used in altering that canon of Scripture which he found received in God's Church.

What books of Scripture the Protestants of England hold for canonical, it is not easy to affirm. In their Sixth Article they say, "*In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.*"

What mean they by these words? This were to make the Church judge, and not Scriptures alone. Do they only understand the judgment of the Church to be a probable inducement? *Probability is not sufficient ground for an infallible assent of faith.* By this rule, namely, "Of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," the whole book of *Esther* must quit the canon, because some in the Church have excluded it from the canon, as Melito Asianus, St. Athanasius, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, (Apud Euseb. lib. iv. Hist. 26. In Synop. In Carm. de Genuin. Scrip.) St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews must also be exiled from the regions of the Bible, as we have the express testimony of St. Augustine, who, admitting the book to be canonical, says, "When Abraham (Gen. xiv.) was blessed by Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High God, of whom many and great things are

said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, (7) *which epistle most ascribe to the Apostle Paul, and some deny it.*"—St. Aug. De Civit. Dei, lib. 16, Edit. Bened. Parisiis, 1718-34.

And Luther says (and surely no Protestant will maintain that he is not in the Church) even in the times of St. Gregory, "the Jews place the book of *Esther* in the canon; which yet, if I might judge, doth rather deserve to be put out of the canon."—*Luth. de Serv. Urb. con. Erasm.* tom. ii. Wit. fol. 471. And of Ecclesiastes he says, "This book is not full; there are in it many abrupt things. He wants boot and spurs, that is, he hath no perfect sentence; he rides upon a large reed, like me when I was in the monastery."—*Luth. in Lat. serm. Conciv. Fran.* in 8vo. imp. ann. 1571. And much more is to be read in him; for he says further, that the said book was not written by Solomon, but by Syrach, in the time of the Maccabees; and that it is like to the *Talmud*, (the Jews' Bible) out of many books heaped into one work, perhaps out of the library of king Ptolomeus."—*Luth. in Ger. coll. Lutheri, ab acrifabro, ed. Fran. tit. de lib. Vet. et Nov. Test.* fol. 379. And further, he says that he does not believe all to have been done that is there set down.—*Lib. Tir. Edit. Patriar. et Prophet. et Pro.* fol. 282.

He teaches also the Book of Job "to be, as it were, an argument for a fable (or comedy), to set before us an example of patience."—*Luth. Tit. de Lib. Vet. et Nov. Test.*

And he passes, moreover, this general censure on the books of the prophets:—"The sermons of no prophet were written whole and perfect, but their disciples and auditors snatched up now one sentence, and then another, and so put them all into one book; and by this means

the Bible was preserved."—*Luther*, fol. 380.

If this be so, the books of the Prophets, not being written by themselves, but promiscuously and casually by their disciples, will soon be called in question. Are not, let me ask, these errors of *Luther* *fundamental*? And yet, if Protestants deny the infallibility of the Church, upon what certain ground can they disprove these *Lutheran*, or rather, to express it more properly, these *Luciferian* blasphemies? Oh godly reformer of the Roman Church!

But to return to our English canon of Scripture. In the New Testament, by the above-mentioned rule (namely, "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church") several books of the New Testament must be disauthorized, or rather dis-canonized, that is, all those which some ancients have doubted, and those which several Lutherans have of late denied. It is worthy of observation, that the above-mentioned *Sixth Article* specifies by name all the books of the *Old Testament* which they hold for canonical; but of those of the *New Testament* its words are these,—“As they are commonly received, we do receive and account them canonical.” The mystery is easy to be unfolded. Had they descended to particulars, they must have contradicted some of their chief brethren. But now, as to the words, “*As they are commonly received*,” &c. I ask, By whom? By the Church of *Rome*? Then, by the same reason, we must receive several books of the *Old Testament* which they reject. Or do they mean “as commonly received by Lutherans?” Then with Lutherans they must discard some books of the *New Testament*. If it be the greater or less number of voices that must cry up or cry down the canon of Scripture, our Roman

canon will preponderate; and, among Protestants, the certainty of their *faith* must be reduced to an *uncertain* controversy of fact—namely, whether the number of those who reject or of those who receive such and such Scriptures be greater. Their faith must alter according to years and days. When *Luther* first appeared, he and his disciples were the greater number of that new church; and so this claim (*of being commonly received*) stood in their favour, till *Zuinglius* or *Calvin* grew to some equal or greater number than that of the *Lutherans*, and then this rule (*of commonly received*) will canonize their canon against the *Lutherans*.

Above all, I desire to know, upon what infallible ground in some books they agree with us against *Luther* and several principal Lutherans, and in others agree with *Luther* against us? Seeing, therefore, that they disagree among themselves, it is evident that they have no certain rule to know the canon of Scripture, in the assigning of which some of them must of necessity err, because, of contradictory propositions, both cannot be true.

Again,—there is no such word as *ιερεὺς*, my friend says, in the Bible. I showed it him in the *Apocalypse*, and my friend took particular care to give no answer. I pointed out the word *ιερεὺς* there; but, whether it is or not, my friend has it proved to him satisfactorily to night by two Greek lexicographers, that *ιερεὺς* and *λειτούργος* are synonymous.

Now, my friend has asserted—and it stands prominently in the little part of our Discussion that is published—he has asserted that *Pascasius Rhadbert*, a monk, as he declares, of the ninth century, invented transubstantiation. Let me now call on my friend to put his

ingenuity on the rack to-night. If Pascasius Rhadbert invented transubstantiation, let him account for this single fact which I am going to lay before his eyes. These, my friends, are the words of Gregory, who lived in the *sixth* century, before Pascasius Rhadbert was heard of in the ninth. Here is St. Gregory in the sixth century:—

“Christ is both the verity and figure: the verity, by his body being made of bread; and the figure, by what outwardly appeareth.”—*St. Greg. Pasch. Hom. cvii. vol. ii.*

Yes, my friends, and in this doctrine all the fathers agree; for, as St. Leo the Great observes (and he flourished A.D. 440):—

“Hoc enim ore sumimus, quod fide creditur.—*For we receive that by the mouth which is believed by faith.*”

And mark, my friends, Catholics do not deny that the *presence* of Jesus Christ in the *Eucharist* is *spiritual*, provided it be granted them that it is corporeal *as to the substance*; that is, in more plain terms, that the *body of Jesus Christ is present*, but in a *divine, supernatural, incomprehensible* manner, which the senses cannot reach or attain to; spiritual, inasmuch as the mind, alone subject to faith, can know it; and that its end is entirely celestial. St. Paul has justly called the human body, raised from the dead, a *spiritual body*, on account of the qualities it was vested with—divine, supernatural, and above the reach of the senses. With much more reason may the *body* of our *Saviour*, placed in the *Eucharist* after so incomprehensible a manner, be so called, as the illustrious Bossuet has so beautifully and gloriously proved.

But hear the glorious St. Gregory, converter of this ungrateful island, once more:—

“This victim, or sacrifice, doth

marvellously deliver a soul from eternal destruction, and doth also renew unto us, in a mystery, the death of the Only-Begotten, who, although rising again from the dead, he doth not now die, and death shall no more triumph over him; yet, living in himself immortally and incorruptibly, is sacrificed again for us in this mystery of the holy Sacrifice; for his body is received there, his flesh is given for the salvation of the people, his blood is now poured out, not into the hands of the unfaithful, but into the mouths of the faithful. Hence, let us consider what a manner of sacrifice that is for us, which, at the voice of the priest, doth open the heavens for our absolution. In those mysteries of Christ the companies of angels are present, the lowest things are joined in fellowship with the highest, earthly things with heavenly, and of visible and invisible one thing is made.”—*St. Greg. lib. i. 4th dial. c. 58.*

That, my friends, is precisely the doctrine of transubstantiation in our catechisms at this day; and yet, forsooth, the Protestant population of this country is to be imposed upon by pompous declaimers, and by my learned friend is to be told that Pascasius Rhadbert, an obscure monk of Saxony, was the first inventor of the doctrine of transubstantiation. But, my friends, it would be hard for us to be obliged to rest on the sixth century. We spring further; we take up all the fathers of the Church of successive ages, all vying with one another in using the strongest words to declare that it is the real body and blood of our Lord, and that those who take it as mere bread and wine have no life within them—no chance of eternal salvation.

My learned friend states that Gregory disbelieved the Book of

Maccabees. I deny the unfounded assertion. I acknowledge, that if he read the book as my friend reads it, he might possibly come to such a conclusion. But I must remind my friend, upon this subject, of what St. Jerome, on the twenty-second chapter of Isaiah, and St. Augustine, lib. xviii. *de Civit. Dei*, cap. 36, says upon the subject. The words are :—

“Machobæorum libros, non Judæi, sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet.”—
“The Books of the Maccabees are not held to be canonical by the Jews, but by the Church.”

Now, then, mark! St. Gregory means precisely the same when he mentions them as not being canonical; that is, they were not canonical with the Jews; but he did not here mean that they were not canonical at all. The Council of Carthage fixed the genuineness of a book in the year 398; and, though I am not prepared to say that St. Gregory was bound to believe them canonical, yet the General Council of Trent has definitively declared these books to be canonical.* Your Bible, therefore, is but a *detrunca-tion* of the sacred volume. We know that, even in the seventh century, there were some doubts about the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is enumeratad by the Council of Carthage. There were some doubts about it, but it was not a mortal sin to deny the authenticity of it. There were some who did not believe in it, but they were not heretics. But when the Council of Trent, or when any other Council, has once pronounced the apostolicity of a tenet or authenticity of a book, it remains settled. The Council of Nice decided on the divinity of Christ when it was called in question by Arianism—they settled it for ever, and you Protestants bow together with us to its authoritative

decision. But they did not prove it from the Bible. How did they account for it? They said—“So we have received it from our fathers, and from father to father down to us. It is so, undoubtedly, and it is to be collected also,” said they, “from the New Testament.”

[The learned gentleman’s hour here expired.]

Rev. J. CUMMING.—My learned antagonist, justly feeling that, not only in the course of the statements I have orally made, but also in the printed report of those statements, Transubstantiation runs a risk of being laid in its grave, even in the estimation of its now most strenuous advocates, and that this doctrine is in the greatest jeopardy in the minds especially of his Roman Catholic friends, has laboured hard again to set it on its legs, and to deck it out in all the gaudy drapery of Roman Catholic assumption. But I defy him, after the refutation by which it has been crushed—I defy the Roman Catholic Institute, I defy the whole body of Roman Catholics—priests, bishops, and popes, if even they had the magic powers of the Witch of Endor, to resuscitate that doctrine from its merited grave, and set it before even Roman Catholics whole and intact. He knows the doctrine is done for in every rational and dispassionate mind in this assembly, and therefore he is trying the best he can to reanimate the carcass, and expunge the *hic jacet* I have indelibly writ upon its tombstone. But his mellifluent incantations are to my hearing nothing more than the requiems my weeping opponent chants over its remains. He is but a mourner at its miserable funeral.—After his remarks upon Transubstantiation, he went again to the mass, and also to the meaning of *λειτουργίῳ*. Now,

in two different speeches I have shown that the word λειτουργέω does not mean "to offer the *propitiatory* sacrifice of the mass." He persists that it does. I showed you that angels in the Bible were called πνεύματα λειτουργικά, "ministering spirits," which, according to my opponent's patent interpretation of λειτουργικά, must mean that angels offer the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass. I told him also in one of my former speeches, that to kings the same word is applied, and therefore it must be true that they offer propitiatory sacrifice. Still he persists in what he knows to be pure nonsense, and demands more arguments. I can only reply, I have given him *arguments*, but I *cannot* give him *understanding*. He went back also to the use of the word ἱερεὺς, and he asked me to show that it was not in the New Testament. That it is in the New Testament I deny not; for all believers as such are called ἱερεῖς. "*Ye*," says the apostles, (1 Peter ii. 9,) addressing the *laity*, "*ye* are a royal priesthood." "*He*," say the redeemed, the laity, in the Revelations, "hath made us kings and PRIESTS unto God." Thus, ἱερεὺς is used, but applied to the laity. It is not in any one instance the *official* designation of a gospel minister. Now let any Roman Catholic go to his priest and say, "Sir, I am an ἱερεὺς, if the Bible be true," and he will find that his priest will instantly pronounce him an insolent heretic, and tell him he assumes a character to which he has no right. Nevertheless, the Romish priest is the usurper, and the word of God is right when it says of all believers, "*Ye* are a royal priesthood."

My opponent quoted in the next place, a variety of passages on the meaning of the word sacrifice. We do not disclaim sacrifices. We have

offerers of sacrifice in our Church. (Rom. xii. 1.)—"Present your bodies living sacrifices unto God." Praise and prayer are called sacrifices—"the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." We admit that the word "sacrifice" is fairly and legitimately applied to these, but we deny that there is repeated a *propitiatory* sacrifice, or that the priests of the Church of Rome can offer the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ, a *propitiatory* sacrifice as it is offered in the mass at the Roman Catholic pseudo-altars.—My antagonist then endeavoured to show you that I merely quoted proofs of persecution, but not on the part of the Church of Rome, or any other, but only of individuals whose names I gave,—thus never excusing his Church without destroying her pretences to unity. Now I quoted the massacre of St. Bartholomew, not for the sake of the dreadful enormities by which it was characterized, but to show you how kings and cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Pope himself, the professed vicar of Christ, looked upon that bloody massacre. The statement which I made was, that the Pope was rejoiced at the spectacle, and that he sent a cardinal to congratulate the king, and thus gave the dreadful butchery his imprimatur. I quoted this massacre, not by any means for the sake of recapitulating its horrors, but of showing you the precise feeling entertained by the Church of Rome on the extermination of heretics; and more especially, that if God would not have chosen such men as Luther to *reform* the Church, still less would he have chosen such men as Pius V. to *defend* the Church.

My opponent denies that a medal was struck.

MR. FRENCH.—I do.

REV. J. CUMMING.—I have seen

the fac-simile of it, and I only can say, in order to make your denial good, that you must cast Fleury, the most celebrated ecclesiastical historian, overboard, with the rest of the doctors, and my senses too. [Laugh.] He casts from him every historian who obstructs the march of his rhetoric. He has flung Dupin and Bossuet and Baronius to the wind, and now stands magnificent and alone, amid the ruins of history, and theology, and doctors, the undaunted advocate of his Church. If Mr. French will not take the authority of his own Church, I cannot help it. I, however, shall be satisfied with such authority, and this audience will be satisfied also :—

“Gregory XIII. only regarding the good which he thought likely to result from this to the Catholic religion in France, ordered a procession, in which he himself joined, from the church of St. Peter’s to the church of St. Lewis, to return thanks to God for so happy a result ; and, to perpetuate the memory of this event, he caused several medals to be struck, wherein he himself is represented on the one side, and on the other side an angel carrying a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, exterminating the heretics, and more particularly the admiral. In Spain, the same deed was panegyricized in the presence of King Philip II., and they dared to call it the triumph of the Church Militant.” — *Fleury’s Ecclesiastical History*, vol. xxiii. book 170, p. 557. Printed at Nismes, 1780.

Where now is my opponent’s denial ? Is the Papal Apostasy so destitute of defence that she must quench the lights of literature—the annalists of the Church, and the historians of the world, before she can maintain her proud and imperious pretensions ?

Mr. FRENCH [interrupting].—Will you let me see that ?

Rev. J. CUMMING.—Certainly. “Fleury’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. xxiii. page 557.” For a perfect picture of the whole transaction, as well as other traits of Pius V. I refer also to his “Life and Pontificate,” ably drawn by the Rev. J. Mendham—a work of profound research.

My opponent’s next remark had some reference to Calvin. He referred to the fact, that Calvin sanctioned the burning of Servetus at the stake. I do not deny historical facts. It is true, but how is this to be explained ? I repeat to Mr. French, what he seems slow to learn, that Calvin came out of the bosom of a Church where such things were as common as they were canonical ; and, not being soon enough disinfected of the contagion of murderous principles, he became accessory to the awful deed to which allusion has been made.

Calvin, however, is neither pope, nor law, nor precedent, to me. The BIBLE alone is my Rule of Faith, and on it such murderous deeds cannot be fastened by any art, or in any shape ; but the sanguinary deed to which I referred, can be fastened as a millstone about the neck of the Church of Rome, being done by a Church that is *semper eadem*, infallible from first to last, and by the express sanction of its Rule of Faith, and never abjured or repented of.

Again, he quoted Knox recommending idolaters to be put to death. Now Knox was a priest of the Church of Rome ; he had been thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of persecution, and it was not to be expected that he would come forth perfectly untainted from the atrocious councils of Gregory XIII., or get rid at once of the old

heaven unless by special miracle. Even if these hackneyed charges be true, and some of them are not, yet our Rule of Faith condemns the conduct of Calvin and Knox in these points, and in its condemnation we heartily concur.

With respect to Pope Pius V., who originated the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the interesting question is, As we Protestants condemn consistently the errors of Calvin and Cranmer, how does the Church of Rome look at the murders of her past history in the present day? This is the most vital question, you observe. Every Protestant in this room stands up and deprecates and condemns the misguided views of Calvin; but how does the Church of Rome look at the conduct of Pope Pius V., who originated the massacre of St. Bartholomew? You shall have the judgment of modern Roman Catholics, from their own Missal:—

“O God, who wast pleased to choose blessed Pius, chief bishop, to *crush* the enemies of thy Church, and repair the Divine worship, grant us to be defended by his protection, and so to adhere to thy commandments, that, overcoming all the snares of enemies, we may rejoice in perpetual peace.”—*Missale*, p. 584, May 11.

Thus, Roman Catholics, you are taught lessons of blood in the very heart of your devotions. You are led to look up to, hear, and imitate a man, who, to extinguish truth and elevate the despotism of a superstitious hierarchy, was ready to wade through seas of blood.

Pope Pius V. is here recorded as a distinguished saint !! and a prayer is offered up that blessings may descend on you through the intercession of him who had heart to crush the bodies when he could not crush the arguments and faith of the

saints. This saint (!!) is the man who originated the massacre of St. Bartholomew; whose memory is cherished in the Missal, your public liturgy, over which, if scriptural, only mercy and truth ought to meet together, and righteousness and peace to kiss each other.

The Church of Rome is indefensible. That hoary mother of evil is the worst client the learned gentleman ever had to deal with. In the course of his most earnest defences, she lets out secrets that show her counsel does not believe what he pleads.

He stated that these remarks, which referred to proofs of the corruption of the Roman Catholic system, were not authorized by authentic documents. This is gratuitous assertion. I quoted them, as he knows, from the authentic and accredited documents of his Church. In respect to relics, he himself knows that the Creed of Pope Pius IV. holds that the relics of saints are to be venerated, a doctrine also which is universally inculcated by his Church in her different catechisms.

He then quoted the circumstance of some person's bidding 100*l.* for a remnant of Johanna Southcote and others. Nothing is more common than for antiquaries to offer large sums of money for such rare things. An *auctioneer* eulogizing a fragment of Johanna to vertuosos, and a POPE canonizing and commending to the veneration of the faithful the rich catalogues of relics I read to you, are, in a Roman Catholic's judgment, not exactly parallel.

The usual false statement was next made, that certain books of the Bible had been lost. My reply is, What became of the infallibility of the Church in all ages which suffered these books to be lost? What says the infallible Church in defence

of her fallible conduct? Drowsy guardian! Did she drop them, or burn them? What were her popes doing? Were they sleeping, or busy in reading the legends of the monks, while they suffered the books of the Bible to be lost? But once more let me repeat, I deny the truth of this charge, and I call upon him to prove that any part of the sacred canon has been lost. I call upon him to prove that the lost books were inspired. He knows that he cannot. He can neither prove they were inspired, nor prove that they were part of the sacred canon. He supposed that because the book of Jasher is mentioned in the Bible, that it is part of the sacred canon. This proves too much. The Greek poet Epimenides is mentioned by the Apostle Paul: the poet Aretus is also quoted to illustrate an argument; but it does not follow that either is part of the sacred canon.

He next refers to certain passages in the Psalms, which he says are wanting in our Bible. Now I think he will repent that he directed me to it, after you have heard the following statement. In the first place, the way in which the Church of Rome arrived at this extraordinary conclusion, that our version has left out certain verses in one of the Psalms, is this:—The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, quotes several verses from two distinct Psalms. The Papal Church in her infallible wisdom judges that because the Apostle quotes all these verses in one chapter, therefore they must be in one Psalm. The Apostle, however, quoted different Psalms, and embodied them in three or four successive verses, or in one continuous passage or argument.

And in fact, when I refer to the Psalm to which he has alluded, namely, the 13th in his (the Douay) Bible, what do you think is the case?

The Church of Rome, conscious of her fallibility, gives us the third verse of the Psalm just as it occurs in our authorized version. She then interlards three verses without numbers, as if standing mementos of her tampering; and after these three unnumbered verses she gives the fourth verse, with the numeral 4, as in our translation.

In the Hebrew these supplementary verses are of course wanting.

If there is a Hebrew scholar in the room, let him look at this Hebrew Bible, and see if I am not right.

MR. FRENCH.—In the Septuagint they are.

REV. J. CUMMING.—They are *not* in the Hebrew. I presume you do not deny that Hebrew is the original tongue in which the Old Testament was written. Now this is another specimen of the mistakes of my learned antagonist. He charges the Protestant Church *with subtracting from the Bible, and it turns out it is only the Romish Church adding to the Bible. Ex uno disce omnes.* [Laughter.] The next remark which he made was about Chillingworth retaining tradition. My reply for the hundredth time is, that whatever Chillingworth or any other person may do, it does not at all affect our Rule of Faith.

He next referred to the fathers, and said that they all agreed in fundamentals. Now Mr. French knows that St. Cyprian maintains that all the apostles were equal. Now observe what is involved in this. It implies that the Pope is not supreme. He states that the Pope is the head of his church, and yet one of his own fathers broadly denies this statement. My opponent has only to refer to my extracts, to see that the fathers are tolerably unanimous against Popery at least.

At least one illustrious father

declares by fair implication, if not actually, that the Pope has no more business to usurp the supremacy over other bishops, than he has to usurp it over sailors, soldiers, and kings. My opponent blazes away about victory, knowing well he is wrong all the while. Gregory the Great, to whom I have referred, has expressly asserted that he who should assume the name of universal bishop would himself be the forerunner of Antichrist; and not only that, but this same Gregory states that the books of Maccabees are not canonical, while also, in the present Pope's opinion and in Mr. French's, they are canonical. Now how he can reconcile these two I do not know. Rather than admit the fathers' contradictions, he will call black white. In reference to the supremacy of Peter, I will just give you one extract from the fathers:—

Cyprian's Prefatory Address to the Bishops at the Council of Carthage.

"No one of us has set himself up as the bishop of bishops, or has driven by tyrannical fear his colleagues to the necessity of obeying him; since every bishop has his own will for the exercise of his liberty and power, and can no more be judged by another than he can judge another."—*Sentence of eighty-seven Bishops in the Council of Carthage. Labbé and Cossart's Councils* vol. i. p. 786.

"The other apostles were, the same as Peter, endowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power; but the beginning proceeded from unity, that the Church of Christ might be shown to be one."—*Unity of the Church*, p. 10.

The Church of Rome holds now that the priest JUDICIALLY pardons sins, *i.e.* as God pardons it. Augustine and Jerome, as my extracts

last evening prove, agree with the Protestant Church, and the Church of England specially, and hold that the minister absolves DECLARATIVELY, which is a momentous distinction. The priest assumes, in giving a *judicial* absolution, the office of God: the Protestant minister, in giving a *declarative*, the office of a servant. This seems to be the main substance of my antagonist's remarks. There is, by the bye, some excuse for Pope Gregory the Great for denying the book of Maccabees to be canonical, as really the canon which declares the Apocrypha inspired was not settled by a general council till many centuries afterwards. The canon of the Romish Church was settled just 1500 years after the birth of Christ, that is, only 900 years after Gregory the Great. Now what was the Romish Church about all this time? Was she dead or asleep? And how came this pope in the sixth century thus to break up the assumed unity by differing on a doctrine of faith, and stand contradicted, audibly and openly, by a general council in the 16th century? Stupid fellow that he was, why did he not hold his tongue? Here, however, is a pope saying one thing, and a council the very opposite; and, what is yet more wonderful still, here is a member of the Romish Institute in the 19th century persisting they are unanimous: one half of her fallibility fighting against the other half. The popes and cardinals of the Romish Church are like the cats of Kilkenny, that fought till nothing but their tails were left.

Now, then, look at the two Rules of Faith. The Protestant Church holds the Bible, and the Bible *alone*, to be the Rule of Faith—a rule Mr. French has not touched. The Roman Catholic Church holds the

Bible and unwritten tradition, and these two expounded by the Church, portions of which are of yesterday, to be the Rule of Faith; and the last two I have annihilated. All my opponent attempts is to repeat his stale and a hundred times refuted objections. Our Rule of Faith is of apostolic origin; the Romish Rule of Faith is an upstart—a modern adoption, which you have seen to be self-contradictory when reduced to its heterogeneous elements by the application of Scripture and common sense—two tests a Romanist hates. Our Rule of Faith recognises as infinite and all-sufficient *one* sacrifice for sins once for all; the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith has many sacrifices, which cannot take away sin. Again, our rule, the word of God, sealed eighteen centuries ago, says, "*One* priest with an intransmissible priesthood." The Roman Catholic has successive priests or many priests, who impiously arrogate the exclusive attribute of Christ. The Apostolical Church by our Rule of Faith has one breaking of bread. The Roman Catholics, according to their Rule of Faith, break no bread at all: it ceases to be bread, and becomes flesh. The Apostolical Church, by our Rule of Faith, says, "Ye shall not bow down to any graven thing." The Roman Catholics, according to their Rule of Faith, say, "Ye *shall* bow down to a graven thing." We have but one Mediator, all-perfect and all-glorious for intercession as for redemption—they have many mediators. The Bible tells us that "bodily exercise," or penance, "profiteth little;" the Church of Rome says it profits much. The Bible says, "Scripture is profitable for all;" the Church of Rome says, "By no means; for, if generally read, it is productive of more evil than good." The Bible says, "Prove *all*

things;" the Church of Rome says, "Prove nothing, but take everything the Church says for infallible truth." The Bible says, "Try the spirits whether they be of God;" the Church of Rome says, "Do not try any of them, but believe all." The word of God says, "A bishop must be the husband of one wife:" the Church of Rome says, "he must be the husband of none." The Bible says, "The wages of sin is death, and he that breaks the law in one point is guilty of all;" the Church of Rome says, "that venial sins do not break charity between God and man, much less between man and God." The Bible says, "that the stealing an apple, or eating the forbidden fruit, brought death into the world and all our woe;" the Church of Rome says, that "the stealing of an apple or a pin does not break charity between man and God, much less between God and man." The Bible says, "The blood of Christ cleanseth from *all* sin;" the Church of Rome says, "Purgatory must burn out those sins which the blood of Christ cannot cleanse." The Bible says, "The love of God is the fulfilling of the law;" the Roman Catholic Church says, and Mr. French agrees with it, "that the fear of hell, with confession, is perfectly sufficient for salvation, without one atom of the love of God." Again the Bible says, "Marriage is honourable among all men;" but the Church of Rome says "it is not honourable among priests." Our Rule of Faith—and I might quote many more instances—secures to us the possession of all these beautiful truths. The Roman Catholic Rule of Faith leads to the confession of sentiments, and the adoption of principles, diametrically at war with the oracles of God. Our rule makes men saints; theirs

must make men demons. Our rule gives glory to God; theirs would spoil the Eternal of his attributes and honour. Our rule makes the wilderness as Eden; their rule has made it a wide-spread Aceldama. The Bible guides souls to glory and honour; Tradition yields them a lurid light that leads its many victims by a broad way to ruin.

All Scripture proves it is your duty and right to read the Bible. I quote John v. 39:—"Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." I quote again Deuteronomy vi. 6, 7, 8, 9:—"These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gates." "Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read." Luke xi. 28—"Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it."

Again, 2 Peter i. 19—"We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well to take heed." But the pretended successor of Peter says, "Ye do ill to read the Scriptures."

Again, Joshua i. 8—"The book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein."

This was addressed to the general of an army, you observe. Again, we read of the prime minister of Candace, Queen of Ethiopia, that in his chariot, and travelling, before he became a Christian, he read the

Scriptures. He searched for truth in the Scriptures.

Again, Acts xvii. 11—"These were more noble than those of Thessalonica; in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so."

Second Epistle of Timothy iii. 15.—"From a child thou hast known the Scriptures."

Again, St. James addresses his Epistle, not to bishops and priests only, but to the twelve tribes scattered abroad.

St. Peter addresses his First Epistle to those scattered throughout Pontus, Asia, Pamphylia, &c.

Again, St. John says, "I write to fathers, to young men, and children." Thus, my Roman Catholic auditors, the Bible is addressed to you, and your priests have no right to interdict it; and the same apostle, in his Second Epistle, writes to an "elect lady."

These are plain homely truths, but I presume my opponent will meet these and other arguments in the way in which Roman Catholics meet what they cannot refute,—by alleging *they are calumnies*.

In the next place, let me show you the *sufficiency* of Scripture. It proclaims its own sufficiency [holding up the Bible]. "To the law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to that, it is because there is no light in them." It is, therefore, the sole arbiter of truth, and if sufficient, there is no need of tradition.

Again, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 29, (or in the Roman Catholic version Paralipomenon):—

"And he," that is, Josiah the king, "called together all the ancients of Judah and Jerusalem, and went up to the house of the Lord, and *all the men of Judah*, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the priests

and the Levites, and *all the people from the least to the greatest*. And *the king read* in their hearing in the house of the Lord *all the words of the book*. And standing up in his tribunal, he made a covenant before the Lord to walk after him, and keep his commandments, and testimonies, and justifications, with all his heart, and with all his soul, and to do the things *that were written in that book which he had read*. And he adjured *all that were found in Jerusalem and Benjamin to do the same*; and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did according to the covenant of the Lord the God of their fathers. And Josias *took away all the abominations* out of all the countries of the children of Israel; and made all that were left in Israel to serve the Lord their God. *As long as he lived they departed not from the Lord the God of their fathers.*"

Again, Luke xvi. 29. — "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." The rich man in hell begged that a special messenger might be sent to earth to lead his brethren, but the reply is, that "if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they believe if one rose from the dead." Acts xvii. 11 — "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica; in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so; therefore many of them believed."

Thus, the Bereans tried the preaching of an apostle by our Rule of Faith. Our blessed Lord refuted every error, confirmed every statement, impressed every doctrine, with our Rule of Faith alone. "It is written," "How readest thou?" were his constant appeals.

The Scribes and Pharisees were the forefathers of the priests of the Church of Rome. Tradition was a

part of their Rule of Faith. Our Lord constantly opposed the Scriptures to their tradition. In other words, our blessed and adorable Saviour sealed and sanctioned the Protestant Rule, and reprobated and condemned the Romish Rule. Tradition is denounced in Scripture as the prolific mother of heresy, superstition, and idolatry. The Bible is exalted in Scripture as the only, the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

My opponent quoted that text of Malachi—"The priest's lips shall keep knowledge; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts;" but, according to his convenient custom, forgot to quote the verse which immediately follows:—"But ye (priests) are departed out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble." This shows that the preceding text is not a prophecy or promise, because it is not fulfilled; but a declaration of duty. It is a most immaterial thing, whether we translate it *should* or shall. "Thou shouldst not steal" is every whit as prohibitory of theft as our Protestant rendering, "Thou shalt not steal." There is no difference in fact.

My opponent's attempts to explain away his blunders had better have been suppressed. Bad apologies and limping explanations make matters worse. The papacy is done for, in the minds of many of my opponent's followers. The *priests who came with him have already deserted him as bad counsel*, and who knows but they may have retired to cleave to our Rule of Faith, and to cast to the moles and bats the rubbish of the Romish Apostasy! Priests, however, have shown themselves fallible in every age. Aaron, the high priest, fell into idolatry: were the Jews, therefore, excusable in fol-

lowing him? Urijah, a priest, enjoyed unbroken succession from Aaron; but was he right in introducing idolatry into the temple? The Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' chair, and yet rejected the Son of God. The Pope sits as the man of sin in the temple of God; are we therefore to follow him? God forbid. Hear the Apostle in Galatians i. 8—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed."

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."—*Thess.* i. 21.

"Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are going out into the world."—1 *John* iv. 1. It is emphatically true of the Papacy.

"Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Harken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you—they speak a version of their own heart."—*Jeremiah* xxiii. 16.

How awfully priests err, we see in the following fact:—The high priest at the commencement of the Christian history—a priest of uninterrupted succession—pronounced that the Son of God had spoken blasphemy; and are the priests of the Church of Rome so secure in their rapid boast of infallibility that such a result might not follow now, as then in their case? I believe that if the Son of God were to appear on earth, the Church of Rome would shout, "Crucify him, crucify him." I certainly do hold, that the Pope is indeed the successor of Peter in one respect—namely, that he denies *his Lord and Master*; but not Peter's successor in another respect, inasmuch as he neither retracts nor repents. Be not deceived, dear friends, with the quibbles of schoolmen. Go afresh to the fountain of truth. I repeat, "Though an angel

from heaven should descend and preach any other gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Ponder prayerfully the numerous texts I have quoted, to which my opponent as usual will not attempt a reply. Every solid argument he either skips over or calls a calumny. These texts, I say, demonstrate that you have a right indisputable from heaven to peruse the Scriptures, and to search whether what ye hear be so or not. *Secondly*, these texts prove that the Scriptures, by their own declaration, are a full and sufficient Rule of Faith without the aid of tradition. And, *thirdly*, the Scriptures prove that you are not so to pin your faith to those who profess to sit in the chair of Moses or of Peter, and who proclaim themselves to be invested with the attributes of infallibility, as to believe implicitly what they say; but, contrariwise, you are to bring all the declarations of your Church, all the professions of your priests, and all the teaching of your doctors, to the above standard whereto Protestants bring theirs—"to the law and to the testimony." All it condemns—and it condemns every doctrine peculiar to the Church of Rome—is heresy; all it applauds is sweet and precious as the living bread.

In drawing my remarks to a close upon this subject, let me state that Mr. French has magniloquently despised one portion of sacred evidence, the most beautiful, and the most universally important, viz. the internal. He has said he defies me to show that the Bible proves itself to be the word of God. Now, the apostle tells us, that "the things which are seen" do manifest the power of the Godhead which created them, and that the creation itself shows in its every line blazoned on its bright brow, that the hand which

made it is Divine. And I do, *à fortiori*, maintain that the second and better creation, the revelation or word of God, bears yet more luminously within it the stamp and impress of its own inspiration and divinity. But remember, this is but one portion of the evidence. We have external evidence, evidence from prophecy, from miracles, from history. Internal evidence is but one portion of that voluminous evidence by which we may prove this blessed book to have God for its author, truth for its matter, and happiness for its issue. But I hold there is a branch of Christian evidence still left, which ought to be alluded to; on which I would not expatiate at length, in dealing with Roman Catholics, since the husks they feed on from the lips of their priests, render it impossible that they should be able to estimate or even understand it. I mean the experimental. Suppose you go into some of the glens and valleys of my native land, and ask the pious patriarch and gray-haired peasant by what process he came to believe that this book was the book of God:—he never read the evidence of a Butler, he never perused the disquisitions of a Chalmers, he never saw the discourses of a Paley—the only books he has on his shelf are those of experimental and practical divinity, such as “Baxter’s Saints’ Rest,” “Howe’s Living Temple,” or “Flavel,” and such like. How comes it then that he holds the Bible to be the word of God? If you were to ask, “Is it by tradition?” he would say, “My Bible tells me that these traditions and commandments of men I am to spurn away from me as unscriptural and unholy.” Then you say, “How came you to know this book to be the book of God?” “Know it!” he would reply, “I know it as truly to

be so as I know that the sun shines in the sky. I have *felt* it in my heart to be the power of God. Through its instrumentality my heart of stone has been broken, my bleeding conscience has been stanchied, my fainting heart has been sustained. My fears of death have been removed by its teaching, my sure hopes of glory have been generated by its promises. I from it have a peace that passeth understanding in all my tribulation, both for the present and the future. ‘When I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil, because thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff comfort me.’”

I will illustrate my meaning. Suppose you were reduced to the extremest weakness by some disease or fever. The physician comes to you (and this will show you the threefold evidence of the Bible in its best light) and prescribes you to take two glasses of port wine every day at twelve o’clock. Suppose after six weeks, on your getting perfectly convalescent, a friend comes to you and says—“You have not been drinking port wine; you have been drinking ditch-water all the while.” You are perfectly astonished. You resolve, however, to convince him that it is port wine. You naturally, first of all, go to the wine-merchant. He tells you—“My agent saw the vineyard, and the grapes when they were on the vine; he saw them in the wine-press; saw the wine made; saw it bottled; he accompanied it to London and placed it upon your table, and he can certify that it is port wine, and not, as you suppose, ditch-water.” *That is external evidence.* Another test is, however, capable of being employed. You go next to the chemist, and he applies to it all the usual and satisfactory chemical tests, and he comes

to the conclusion, after trying it, and proving and testing it, that it is what it is professed to be—fine port wine. *This is the internal evidence.* You add, in the next place, your own testimony. When I was weak it made me strong; when I had no health it restored it to me. I know that it is port wine; I feel its tonic and invigorating power, and all the philosophy and logic in the universe cannot convince me it is ditch-water and not port wine. Now, this last is a specimen of the way in which the Christian reaches the fact, that the Bible is, as it claims to be, the book of God. He has felt within him its transforming power; it has exerted its influence upon his conscience and his heart; and, secure amid impregnable evidence, he smiles at the onset of the Socialist and the sophistries of his fellow-labourer, the Romanist. Never does the glory of the Bible so shine forth as when it flashes its bright beams on the abominations, and corruptions, and superstitions of the Romish Apostasy.

It has been alleged by my opponent, that the Scriptures cannot be understood by the poor and illiterate man. May we not suppose the Son of God at least as able to speak clearly as the Pope? May we not believe the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, to be as clear as the encyclical letter of that Mary-worshipper, Pope Gregory XVI.? If we misunderstand apostles, I should say, judging from the specimens I have seen, we are more likely to misunderstand Romish priests. We Protestants, too, have an infallible authority; Christ has promised that he will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Spirit unto them

that ask him!" The promise respecting him is, that he will guide us into all truth; and we maintain that the result of the last three centuries is, that Christians have been guided into all substantial and fundamental truth. I know that if you sit down and peruse the Bible with the mere dry light of philosophy and of reason, you cannot fully understand it; but then I do equally maintain that, when the promised and prayed-for light of the Holy Spirit of God illuminates the sacred page, or rather, fills the faculties of the reader, you understand and see all necessary truths more clearly.

The reason that we do not understand Scripture more entirely is, that we all retain too much Popery in our practices; we go too much to human exposition, instead of seeking the aid of the only inerrant teacher, the Spirit of God. A Roman Catholic is one who leans on traditions, on priests, and on that mass of corruption and apostasy called the Church. A Protestant is one who avails himself of the aids of history, investigation, learning, and experience, but leans on the Holy Spirit only for sure guidance. The priests of the Church of Rome dread the idea that there is an infallible teacher besides that impious mimic of infallibility called the Pope. The Socinian openly denies the Holy Spirit—the Church of Rome practically despises him. It is possible to understand the letter of Scripture by unaided power, but you cannot savingly feel its power unless by Divine aid; and nothing can be more scriptural and natural than this statement. Suppose you go into the neighbourhood of Windsor during a moonlight evening, you look at the broad and lovely landscape that lies around that magnificent castle. You observe by the dusky light of the moon the blend-

ing and shadowy outlines of the landscape, but the landscape itself you see very indistinctly. The meandering streams make audible music, but their courses you cannot trace; the tints and colours of the flowers are there, but so softened and subdued by the moonbeam light that you cannot distinguish them; oaks, and elms, and firs are there, but the light is not intense enough to allow you to discriminate and distinguish. But if you return to that landscape at mid-day, after the sun has ascended the meridian, you will then see every lineament in all its far-stretching windings,—every stream, as before, eloquent with music, but visible throughout all its meanderings; you will see every flower with its distinctive lines; every blossom in its native tints; and the whole panorama will expand its beauties to the mind, distinct, and clear, and rich in just magnificence and beauty. So it is with the word of God. If I refer to this book by the moonlight ray of reason—by the dim light of human commentators, or by the help of whole conclaves of infallible doctors, it will all appear a mystery and a riddle; but if I refer to it under the light of that glorious “Sun of Righteousness” that shines in the firmament of heaven, then all its precious truths will stand forth in distinct relief, significant of glory yet to be revealed, and depositing its germs and hopes in the heart that opens to receive them; and so truly will your souls be satisfied, that you will turn away with unutterable disgust from the insolent pretensions and soul-murdering heresies of the Romish church. [Sensation.]

Now mark what our Rule of Faith has achieved for us; and, though my opponent has the last speech, and I no power of showing

up its whims as I have done with others, yet I defy him to shake our victories gained in this room. In the first place, it has enabled us to drive away that ferocious Cerberus, the Pope, who would watch and keep us from the pure fountains and living streams of revelation, and has opened to us an uninterrupted and unbroken pathway to its treasures, enabling the thirsty and hard-worked wayfaring man to read the glorious inscription, and reading to obey it —“Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and *he that hath no money*, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.” This is a privilege worthy of the blood of any Protestant martyr. Rome had too long placed an extinguisher upon the oracles of God. She had too long placed a bushel over the lamps of the holy place. Our forefathers, by God’s grace, broke it to atoms; and upon its ruins, which I have exposed and scattered again and again, I invite you to come without any opposition, without any impediment, to the word of God. I would bring your minds at once within the sound of your Saviour’s voice, your attention to the perusal of your Saviour’s letters, and your hearts to a familiarity with the spirit of your Saviour’s doctrine. The Church of Rome has theoretically received tradition as an equal to revelation. But the practical effect of this is, that tradition is all and Scripture is nothing. If I place tradition on the left and the Bible on the right, by-and-by we shall learn to sympathize with the one of these two that is congenial to our fallen hearts: that one is tradition, and the result will be that you will ultimately cleave to tradition and forsake the word of God. “No man can serve two masters.” If a man holds tradition and the Bible both as his

governing rule (knowing what the human heart is), he will cleave to tradition and despise the Bible.

In the next place, our Rule of Faith batters the assumptions of the Mass to atoms; and, raised upon its ruins, as I trust you have seen its ruins spread upon this platform, our blessed Bible proclaims in loud and exterminating accents, "By **ONE OFFERING** he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Our Rule of Faith casts Transubstantiation to the moles and to the bats, showing that this horrible tenet was concocted in some dark age, bearing for its date the ninth century—a fact which cannot be gainsayed by all the logic of my learned and deeply-to-be-pitied antagonist. Our Rule of Faith at once annihilates the Invocation of Saints, and shows that it is a specious theory, and an idolatrous practice. It tells you, in accents piercing and impressive, that you may not, must not, blend the tears of Mary with the blood of Jesus, or the rags of saints with the righteousness of God. It tells you to turn your backs upon saints, and angels, and archangels, and to rest your eye upon one single object—but that object, how glorious! how sufficient! "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." My dear Roman Catholic friends, as you value your never-dying souls, as you desire an eternal heaven, in all time of your wealth, in all time of your tribulation, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, look to Christ, and to Christ only, as your only altar, priest, and sacrifice, all at once.

Our Rule of Faith in the next place breaks up Purgatory, and dissipates its deep delusion for ever. It shows it to be but a crafty device to torture men's consciences with fear, and to fill the pockets of the priests with money, and to rob man

of his peace, society of its property, and God of his glory! Our Rule of Faith tells you of the true Purgatory, the only Purgatory, the all-sufficient Purgatory, that Fountain for all sin and for all sinners; and in its own blessed words announces to man—every man—that Purgatory full of peace—of joy—of holiness, "**THE BLOOD OF JESUS CLEANSSES FROM ALL SIN**"—ALL SIN. Our Rule of Faith destroys and reprobates the mediation and intercession of those who would stand between you and Christ. It tells you to go to Christ alone, and not to Peter, or Mary, or John; and proclaims in its own ever-impressive accents, "There is but **ONE MEDIATOR** between God and man (Mediator of intercession as well as of redemption, as the context shows), the man Christ Jesus." "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." These, then, are the legitimate effects of our Rule of Faith. I trust you have, as Protestants, seen often in this room the glory, and fulness, and sufficiency of the Bible, clearly if not eloquently displayed. I know for certain you have been most deeply convinced, seeing what a poor and miserable defence one of the most acute and strenuous Romanists has made.

Before I sit down I may observe, my opponent will pursue his wonted erratic course. He will give quotations from Calvin, Luther, &c. *which never had an existence*, and which are concocted by Roman Catholics only; he will boast like a Hector, and *inform* you of victory, as you could not otherwise know it; he will repeat what I have a hundred times refuted. Believe nothing he says unless he proves it. Do not take his mystification for argument—his noise about logic for reasoning—his long, and, as I will

show, *untrue* statements about Luther and Calvin, which, even if true, only condemn the apostasy in which they learned their persecuting notions.

I rejoice that many most respectable and influential Roman Catholics have renounced the Church of Rome since this discussion began. I expect more. You cannot stand the full blaze of the glorious Gospel falling on the idolatry and soul-ruining superstitions of your Church. Protestant churches and chapels are already better filled in Hammer-smith. I do not wonder at it. The Papacy and its defenders will boast on till the day that the Son of God consumes Babylon by the brightness of his advent. Pride, self-sufficiency, and self-righteousness are the peculiar inheritance of the Pope, and descend to all beneath him.

How great, Protestants and Roman Catholics, is the contrast presented between the two Churches! Behold the Apostate Church pointing your attention to relics, to a flour-and-water God, to angels and to saints, and beseeching you to look to and to hope through Mary, and declaring Christ approachable through Mary's intercession only. Behold the other Church, telling you to treat saints with the names of saints, with the honour that belongs to them; but in your course to eternity to trouble them not, but to rivet your eye exclusively upon Him "who is able to save you even to the uttermost." Behold the Apostate Church offering up many times the same *soi-disant* propitiatory sacrifice, which can never take away sin, deceiving and deceived. Behold the Protestant Church pointing to the *once-for-all* Sacrifice, offered up once for all for the sins of the world. Behold the Apostate Church placing priests, and popes, and a superstitious hierarchy be-

tween the sinner and his God; and the other declaring that if an angel from heaven or a spirit from hell were to stand between you and the Lord Jesus Christ, that angel or spirit is accursed. Behold the Apostate Church sanctioning and waging persecution, drunk with the blood of saints, whose chosen weapons are the faggot and the flame, and, to keep murder ever near and dear, recording in her Missal special prayers in honour of the murderous Pope Pius V., and the idolater and persecutor, Aquinas; and behold the other Church deploring the least rag of the popish garments retained by a Calvin, and mourning over the remaining leaven of the papacy too long held by Knox; and by the memory of the past, and by the testimony of God, calling upon men to abandon all broken cisterns, and have recourse only to those living streams where mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Look, then, on one picture, and look upon the other, and I am sure, as I have already done, I shall again look upon more of my ingenuous Roman Catholic auditors addressing to our Church, what was addressed to an ancient representative of truth in the word of God—"Where thou goest I will go; where thou walkest I will walk; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

I stand this day before you as the herald of the Eternal, and I adjure you, my Roman Catholic friends, to rise with Abraham of old from the land and habits of idolatry, and to come forth like the patriarch, at God's bidding, to a far better land, which the word of God most clearly shows you. Do not halt. Be men. God prosper the holy of purpose! Remain not in the tombs of Rome's charnel house. Like Lazarus of old, come forth from the grave, and, at the bidding

of the Saviour, throw off the bands and napkins of corruption in which for centuries you have slept. Hear ye not the trumpet cry, "Come forth?" Leave the mephitic vapours of tradition, for the sweets of pure air and untainted truth. Be slaves no more. They only are freemen whom the truth of God makes free, and all are slaves besides. The Angel of the Everlasting Covenant, that ordered Peter to come forth from the prison in which the wicked Herod had placed him, calls in awful and in piercing accents to you, captives and prisoners of Antichrist, bondsmen of Satan—"Come out, that ye partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues." I call on you to come forth—you who, like Samson on the lap of Delilah, have so long and so disastrously slumbered, till ye have been shorn of your moral strength, deprived of your privileges, and denuded of your most precious birth-right; and rest assured that He who says, "Come out of her, my people, and partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues," will give you strength to be faithful even unto death. The Bible, our Rule of Faith, like the star which guided the magi to the manger of the Son of God, will guide you as that star guided them, until it brings you to the feet of Jesus. The great Angel of the Covenant has descended into this better than Bethesda's stream; and now it comes to pass, that whoever drinks of the waters of this life shall thirst again, but whosoever shall drink of the water that Christ shall give him shall never thirst. I implore you, then, by all that is awful in death and glorious in life, as you value your souls, to bear in mind that you will have to answer at the judgment-seat for what you have heard in this room. The very bricks of these

walls will rise at the voice of God and testify against you, if you shut your eyes to God's most solemn truths; the very planks of this building, quickened by Divine power, will rise up and reclaim against you as witnesses. But I expect better things. I know there is a power in this Gospel over your hearts and your consciences, that ye will not, that ye dare not withstand. The Spirit of God will not suffer his word to return to him void. I am sure that yet many more of you will be brought out of that vessel which was built in the storm-blast, amid the eclipse of reason, revelation, and conscience,—which, shattered and open in every part, leaks fearfully, and sinks inch by inch into the fathomless abyss of everlasting and ever-burning wrath,—and look around you for the true ark, and leave the Papacy as a lightning-struck and dismantled vessel. It creaks and labours even now; awful tempests of wrath are already revealed from heaven against it. Come, my friends and fellow-sinners, not to this or that party, not to Calvin or Cranmer, but to that great and glorious Ark,—God manifest in the flesh,—which will bear you through the difficulties, turmoils, trials, and sorrows of this present evil world, many and severe even to the rich and the wealthy, and yet more distressing to the poor and needy,—and will land you, not like the ark of Noah on the barren crags of Ararat, to look forth upon a world depopulated and dismantled, but amid the still waters of perpetual peace, and beside the everlasting hills of the heavenly Jerusalem, even in the bosom of your Father and my Father, of your God and my God. [Strong sensation, and cries of "Order."]

[The reverend gentleman's hour here terminated.]

Mr. FRENCH.—My reverend opponent has been leading you for a long time past through “flowery meads” of meandering oratory; but I, my friends, shall take the liberty of conducting you, in my turn, into the realms of plain, simple, unadorned logic. The track, indeed, which I intend to pursue, will not admit of that glittering confusion of ideas, that verbose mania, by which reason in this assembly has been so long tortured in the last dying speech of my beautifully metaphorical, but sadly unargumentative opponent. It cannot escape your sagacity, my respected auditors, that we have been regaled by my reverend antagonist this evening with a sermon which I have now heard repeated twice eleven times; and I firmly believe there are ladies and gentlemen in this room—frequenters of his chapel I mean, who have heard that identical sermon issuing forth from that same tempestuous, torrent-pouring mouth at least two hundred times. [Laughter.] What effect this, ladies and gentlemen, may have produced upon your minds, I know not; but as to me, I must candidly confess that it has, for lack of anything like argument, which might keep me awake, wearied and dissipated attention, even unto drowsiness. However, my friends, being now in good earnest and thoroughly awake, nay, exhilarated, if I may use the expression, after my little refreshing nap—[laughter]—I shall go immediately to serious matter; and I promise, my friends, I shall propound that matter, in a manner very different from that which has been resorted to by my learned antagonist. I shall make use of plain, unstudied, unaffected language; not speaking to your passions, but speaking to your understandings and your judgment. But

before I come to that solid matter, that tangible, consecutive reasoning which I have in store, and which I intend to offer as a kind of compensation for the time that has been so tediously wasted this evening, I shall beg leave to employ a few moments in refuting an assertion made by my reverend opponent in his concluding address; namely, *that we have lost nothing of an indisputably inspired nature*. This was laid down by my reverend friend in his usual confident and peremptory manner; but listen, my Protestant friends, to the argument by which I refute his position most triumphantly, and then, I exclaim, *Ex uno disce omnes*; that is, from this one involuntary blunder, or voluntary error, of my learned antagonist, call it which you will, learn the fallacy of all his positions in general. I call, then, my learned friend’s attention to the fourth chapter of St. Paul to the Colossians:—

“And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans; and that *ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea*,” chap. iv. ver. 16.

Now I want to know if *that epistle* has outlived the ruins of time? If not, something inspired has undoubtedly been lost; and thou, *confidentissime juvenis*, my reverend antagonist, must remain confuted and confounded.—And now, gentlemen, to discuss the subject without the flowers of oratory, and to rivet, if I can, the attention of my audience to a regularly connected chain of logical deduction, I must beg leave to recal to your minds an observation made by the learned gentleman, and which I left untouched, the time having elapsed, some evenings ago. The learned gentleman told you that your Church (the Protestant Church) was our Church with its face washed. [A

laugh.] This has been often repeated, and I read to you a piece of poetry, if you recollect, containing my answer to the grave-faced bishop who had endeavoured to seduce one of our flock by that very cogent argument; namely, that it was a much better washed Church than ours; in fact, that it was precisely the same—[laughter]—save and except that its walls were much more clean. I suppose he meant more new. [A laugh.] Now the position which I am going to take this evening I shall defend most valiantly. It is one which is not my own, though I shall illustrate it in my own manner, and, I hope, as extemporaneously as my ever-fluently extemporizing friend: *Protestants must either grant that the Catholic Church was the visible Church; or name some other disagreeing from it, and agreeing with Protestants in their peculiar doctrines, in every age previous to the Reformation; or acknowledge that there was no visible Church.* Now it will be impossible for you, my friends, however eager you may be to hear and understand, it will be impossible for you to follow me in the fast manner in which I wish to lead you along, unless you attend very particularly to that proposition; and I shall therefore repeat it once more:—Protestants must either grant that the Church of Rome was the visible Church; or name some other disagreeing from it, and agreeing with Protestants in their particular doctrines, no matter whether Anabaptists, Quakers, or Calvinists; or you and they must acknowledge there was no visible Church. Here, my friends, is the great dilemma, the great, the momentously great subject; and I hope sincerely, and confidently trust, with the assistance of God upon my labours, which I always implore before I enter on

disputation, to put, this evening, an extinguisher on all the pomp and glory of my friend's "meandering" oration. [Tittering.]

This, my friends, was the impregnable position of a Catholic theologian more than a century ago. It gave rise to some little perplexity when it was first enforced upon the attention of Protestants; and Chillingworth, "the most acute logician of all England," as he has been frequently called by his fond admirers, animated by their encouragements, stepped into the field of polemics with all the strength and confidence of a Goliath, to destroy it. Now, my friends, let us examine calmly and impartially in what manner the mighty Chillingworth executed this most arduous task that could possibly be undertaken (mark my words) by a sincere believer in Christianity,—in the profession, I mean, of the Gospel. I must read to you his words alluding to this great question. "We acknowledge," says Chillingworth, "a Church there was, *corrupted indeed universally*, yet such a one as, by God's gracious acceptance, *was still a Church.*"

Such, forsooth, was the ingenious mode of reasoning adopted by "the acute" Chillingworth in answer to this puzzling question!—This was the mode, I say, gentlemen, which Chillingworth, in order to overturn the proposition of the above-stated Catholic theologian, adopted!—This, my friends, was the envenomed arrow aimed by the arm of that renowned Goliath, Chillingworth, against the champion of immortal CATHOLICITY! and which, like all other weapons levelled against us by the adversary, would rebound most violently, could it but reach its intended mark, on the veracity of the Gospel itself. Yes, my friends, the New Testament itself is no more, whatever may

be the triumph of the Deist when the concession is made to him—the New Testament is no more, if the Catholic Church, the grand voucher of its authenticity, ever, if at any one period of its existence, became universally corrupted. Nay, I as a Catholic candidly confess to you, I have reason to suspect the correctness of Scripture, if it be once admitted as a dogma of Christianity, that “the temple of the living God,” as the apostle aptly calls the Church, ever became in any one age of its existence universally corrupted. I find St. Augustine, who wrote in the fourth century, exclaiming, “*Evangelio non crederem, nisi me ecclesiæ Catholicæ commoveret auctoritas!*” That is, “I would not believe in the Gospel itself, unless I were persuaded so to do by the authority of the Catholic Church.” Now, Christians, I contend, (if the universal corruption of the Church be once admitted) would be well entitled to exclaim, if I may latinize my thoughts after the model of St. Augustine’s phraseology, “*Evangelio ipsi non credam, quia me commovere non potest corruptæ ecclesiæ auctoritas.*” That is, my friends, “I will not admit the genuineness of the Gospel, because the authority of a Church universally corrupted is insufficient to persuade me.” That Church, my friends, mark you, ever kept from the earliest ages the said Testament in its fostering bosom; it is by her tradition that I know what books are genuine, and what apocryphal. Prove to me, I say, once prove to me—I do not mean by the wild roar of fanaticism, but by the voice of calm, sensible reasoning—that that sacred depositary of the inspired volume ever became universally corrupted, and I will readily concede, that instead of being the

child of heaven, as I firmly believe it to be, it is but the offspring of an earth-born inspiration, and consequently doomed in its due season, like all other earthly products, to moulder and decay. Thus, therefore, it is, my friends, that the renowned Chillingworth fights the battles of Protestantism, by furnishing arms to the Deist wherewith to batter down the whole fabric of Christianity. To prove my words, let us open this book, which this “universally corrupted” mother has transmitted to her children. I call my friends’ attention to Matthew xvi. 18:—

“And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Now, when Chillingworth contends that the Catholic Church, thus founded by Christ on a rock, was “universally corrupted,” what more cogent argument could he possibly have advanced, as regards the inspiration of the Bible, against its claim to veracity, and that too in opposition to the prediction of its Divine Inspirer, “that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?” How could he enable the Deist more powerfully to prevail against it, and draw down upon it his bitterest ridicule? “Alas! alas!” might the antagonist of Christianity have exclaimed, “Alas for the strength of this boasted, this impregnable rock; this rock, which the Christian himself acknowledges to be a rock of ‘universal corruption.’ Its chief prop, namely, the Holy Ghost, according to Scripture, is to be with it always, even to the end of the world; and yet its integrity is no more; it is ‘universally corrupted!’”

The mass of corruption is not destitute of its wonted inspirer,

according to Chillingworth (for he professes to believe in the promise of our Saviour never to desert it); and yet it is not preserved, even with this omnipotent aid, from the forbidden triumph of *the gates of hell*! Or does Chillingworth mean to contend—for, as he is one of the “most acute” logicians of all England, I must pay some deference to him—does Chillingworth mean to contend that the Catholic Church was still the true Church of God, even when the Spirit that had hovered over it for ages had winged away its flight for ever? Oh! what an uncommon charm must not the name of Chillingworth possess—how deeply must his fond admirers be impressed with a sense of his superior wisdom—to mention such an illogical deduction! To a common apprehension, unversed in the subtleties of artificial argument, the whole affair reduces itself to this: Either the Spirit that was “to be with it always, even unto the end of the world” was with it when the Reformation arose, changing many of its essential fundamental doctrines; or the same Spirit having deserted it, it began gradually to moulder and decay. Now, on such a supposition—namely, that the Spirit no longer abode with it—it is worth while for the Protestant to inquire what became of the prediction of the Gospel, where we find in large, legible characters, that the Holy Ghost was to be with it “*always, even unto the end of the world.*” No man, my friends, who listens attentively to such a train of reasoning, will be disinclined to concede to Chillingworth and his followers—no Catholic, I say, will be unwilling to concede to them, that if “universal corruption” at any one period of time actually overspread the temple of the living God, his Spirit must

necessarily have departed from it; and that all truth could no longer continue to flow from that fountain which, in itself, was all corruption. Yes! on such a supposition, then, I will concede to him, most unhesitatingly, that the house of God, which, in the language of Paul, is “the Church of the living God—the pillar and ground of the truth”—that the Church, I say, thus described by St. Paul is but an illusive phantom, decked, indeed, by the apostle with all the glory of metaphor, but destitute of one shadow of reality. We must, therefore, necessarily take it for granted, that the founders of the Protestant Church reasoned in this manner, when they applied themselves to establish a new Church, in order to supersede the necessity any longer for the corrupted existence of the old one. That Church, therefore, having most demonstrably failed, according to Protestants, how, my friends, can the Bible stand? But no; “the Catholic Church,” says Chillingworth, their mighty champion, “the Catholic Church, though universally corrupted, was yet such a one as, by God’s gracious acceptance, was still a *Church.*”

Now, gentlemen, if it was a Church, and if Chillingworth can name no *other* Church then in existence agreeing in tenets with his own Church, it must necessarily have been *the* Church; and being *the* Church, could it, my friends, I ask, teach falsehood? Being the Church, of which God has said, “If ye neglect to hear the *Church*, ye shall be as an heathen man or publican,” how, let me ask, could a man neglect to hear it when it taught the doctrine of Transubstantiation, without being considered by it as a heathen man and publican? In vain you say that it taught falsehood and error. If the Holy Ghost was “with

it" it could not teach error; if the Holy Ghost was absent from it, there was assuredly no Church at all, and the Gospel is subverted by these predictions, having manifestly failed in their due accomplishment. Let the Deist, when contending with the Protestant, deeply read in the New Testament—let him but commit to memory that verse above stated, and the Protestant is instantaneously put to silence; he may groan under the weight of so ponderous an argument, but remove it he cannot; no, it is utterly irremovable, even with the help of the giant Chillingworth, and that other giant, our Calvinistic orator, Mr. Cumming to boot. Oh! weigh, then, I beseech you, my friends, the strength of these invincible arguments, unadorned with the glaring flowers of oratory—weigh them, I beseech you, in the scales of equity; ask yourselves this plain question, and be not scandalized while I put it: Is there any alternative for you, but to become a heathen man or a publican, and, in the language of St. Paul, to cease "looking for the blessed hope of the glorious appearance of the great God, and our Saviour Christ;"—or to take refuge from so blasphemous an assertion, as that of the Church having been "universally corrupted," in her sacred bosom—to fly, I say, for refuge to the Church of Peter, that unchanged and unchanging "rock," upon which the Church of Christ was built—built, I say, in eternal defiance of the gates of hell, and consequently in all its works and ways unsusceptible of universal corruption?

Irenæus, who lived in a remote age of the Church, in the year 177, says, talking of this Church:—"Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei."—*St. Iren. Edit. Grabe*, lib. iii. p. 266. "Where the Church

is, there is also the Spirit of God." And in the same chapter the same saint says, in direct opposition to Chillingworth—"Ibi est Spiritus Sanctus, *arrhabon incorruptelæ*." "Where the Church is, there is the Holy Ghost—the sure pledge of *uncorruptness*."

Again, St. John says: "One fold, one shepherd."

Now, my friends, where, in the first fifteen centuries, was the Protestant one fold and one shepherd? Where "the one fold, the one shepherd," were during all that space to be found, we Catholics well know. Ay, we know the name of every successive shepherd, since the one sheepfold was first collected by its heavenly Master. But call on Protestants for a similar attestation of their creed—alas! the records are worn out, or undiscoverable; not a vestige of its antiquity remains. The CATHOLIC alone [some whispering and interruption occurring, the learned gentleman said, "There is such a noise; it distracts me, so much whispering." Silence restored, the learned gentleman continued]. The CATHOLIC CHURCH, which alone can prove to you its apostolic descent, cries out with the thundering voice of overpowering truth, to every sect of Reformers alike, in the language of Tertullian:—"Edite origines ecclesiarum vestrarum." "Show us the origin of your Churches."

Yes, and to you, my Protestant friends, of the various sects around me, to each of you I also cry out, "Show us the origin of your Church." Unless you do, we shall never cease to shout out triumphantly, that we alone have an indisputable title to that sacred inheritance, of which ye would fain possess yourselves without any one document of antiquity to prove your right to it. You cannot show us

your "*genus et proavos*," "*your race, your progenitors*," except upon the newly-invented scrolls of modern paper; whereas the records we boast of have outlived the ruins of time; and from age to age some glorious doctor of our Church, that can be named and pointed out to you in calm, unbroken, regular succession, has, in the face of our opponents, waved them triumphantly in his hands. Ye dare not dispute their authenticity. The sight of them alone is amply sufficient, without the help of any other oral argument, in the language of St. Jerome — "*Christi adversum hostes Catholicæ fidei bella bellare*." "To fight the battles of Christ against the enemies of the Catholic Church."

Yes, you yourself confess it; I do not mean that my stern unrelenting Calvinistic opponent will ever confess it—but one more candid, a man more splendidly eloquent than all of them (the Calvinists) put together, confesses it. "The Church of Rome," says Hooker, the eloquent Protestant Hooker, "is no doubt to be considered as a part of the house of God, and we gladly acknowledge them (the Catholics) to be part of the family of Christ."—*Ecclesiast. Polity*.

Now, I ask—for I always prefer logic to oratory—when Hooker acknowledges it to be a part of the house of God, a part of the family of Christ, the sole question I would wish to ask is, Is it an *ancient* part or a modern part? If it be answered An ancient part, the consequences that necessarily follow from it is, that it is the *true*, the true, whole, indivisibly true, and ever-existing Church. Christ's seamless garment cannot be torn asunder; it cannot be rent, or divided into parts. It is by no means reconcilable to the

laws of reason, that being the true Church according to the confession of our adversaries, and consequently being invested with the power of pronouncing him who neglects to hear it as a heathen man or a publican, that those can be of the same family—those who hear, and those whom she declares to be idolaters. It may be called charity in you, Protestants, to concede to Catholics this kind of kindred with themselves, but in rational estimation it is too incoherent to bear the test of substantial argument. The Church which they assert to be universally corrupted, although it be the true Church, cannot surely be presided over by the Spirit of Truth, in their eyes, especially whilst it holds as one of its immutable dogmas, that out of the true Church (cases of invincible ignorance excepted) there is no salvation.

"One of these notes," says Chillingworth, "indeed the only note of the *true uncorrupted Church*, is conformity with antiquity.—I mean the most ancient Church of all, the primitive and apostolic."—P. 69.

Again says Chillingworth:—"No man thinks this controversy is to be tried by most voices, but by the judgment and testimony of ancient fathers and churches."

So say we, my friends; and it is upon this conformity with antiquity that we found our exclusive claims. We hold unrelinquishably to the words of Christ to Peter—"Feed my lambs, shepherdize my sheep, feed my sheep."—John xxi. 15, 16, 17.

And the same words were repeated by the Spirit of God in the Church to his successor, and to the following successors in the chair of St. Peter. Their names are also to be found in our ancient records—a perpetual succession of duly consecrated bishops (whose consecration, mark, my friends, is not a tale of

historical imposition, like that of the parsons of the Church of England) has uniformly pointed out the true flock of Christ, and presided over it. It is, my friends, to this perpetual visibility of the Church in all ages, that I make my appeal; for more than eighteen centuries we knew where to find it—but to you, who protest against its overpowering weight, contrary to all that is venerable and true, to you, I say, my sole answer is, in the language of Tertullian, so many centuries ago—an answer which he gave to those who rose up against Catholicity in those early days—“*Editae origines ecclesiarum vestrarum.*” “*Show us the origin of your Churches.*”

It being therefore evident, my friends, that the Church which is pointed out in the Bible to us, and which Church that book, when we open it, tells us was to be proof against corruption to the end of time,—and therefore could never have become, in the language of that most inconsequential and flimsy (some of the present company excepted)—[laughter]—of all reasoners, Chillingworth—could never have become, I say, as he asserts, “universally corrupted,” without violating the predictions of the Bible—what remains, my friends, but that, following the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, you hasten to enrol your names among the list of its glorious members? Believe me, my friends, when you shall have thus acted, you will no longer be ashamed to contract an acquaintance with the pages of its renowned fathers; you will find, on the contrary, inexpressible delight in poring over those truly, those indisputably Catholic pages, that crush in their sublime march the very fundamentals of every other sect. And, my friends, when in consequence of this

advice which I give you, if you should be inclined to follow it, you take up these holy fathers, and become familiar with their sentiments, you will never cease to wonder at their odious calumniators, who have represented them to you as being the advocates of doctrines which they reprobated with all the power and vigour of their souls, and denounced with all the thunder of their eloquence!

Again, my Protestant brethren, believe me, that the books which constitute the Bible, is a subject worthy, on your parts, of the profoundest study, and one demanding all seriousness. You heard in the last expiring speech of my learned antagonist, the light, airy, fantastic manner in which he wished to do away with that most important question which I put to him so pointedly, so emphatically; namely, How was it that Almighty God, instead of converting, as he most unquestionably did, all nations by the instrumentality of the Catholic missionaries, accomplishing their grand mission by oral instruction, which acted, in the language of St. Paul, as “*the living spirit of God on the fleshly tables of the heart*”—how was it, I say, that God Almighty did not send forth the Bible to be of itself the converter of nations? How happened it that those who actually did convert all nations never propagated the doctrine of Protestantism, that every individual was to interpret that sacred, that recondite treasure of truly celestial learning, according to the gross faculties of his own untutored understanding, without applying for instruction to *the lips of the priest, the angel of the Lord of Hosts?*—(Malachi.)

Again, did you observe the manner in which he answered my question; namely, If God had intended

the Bible to be the Rule of Faith, how is it that he permitted any one particle of it to be irretrievably lost? How is it that your celebrated bishop of *Llandaff* was obliged to confess in his letter, written with the view of silencing that Protestant-nurtured pest to society, Tom Payne, that the Epistle to St. Paul from *Laodicea*, which, in the fourth chapter to the *Colossians* and sixteenth verse, that apostle commands to be read by the *Colossians*, is irrecoverably lost and buried in oblivion? Believe me, my friends, the more sedulously and solicitously ye search, the more ye will be convinced that true consistency of doctrine is to be found alone within the precincts of the Catholic Church. Unpropped by the grand testimony of the Catholic Church, ye will find, my friends, upon investigation, that the Bible itself has no rational ground whereon to stand—nothing of an argumentative nature to support it, save and except that which is supplied to it by that deadly antagonist to sound logic, wild and ranting enthusiasm; in other words, and my learned opponent shall supply them, that which is supplied to it *by the gathering up of the glorious inspiration of Protestantism*. On the other hand, ye will find that, led and disciplined by the living instructress of all ages and all nations, *the Catholic Church*, every page, every line of that sacred volume teems with evidence of its inspiring God, conducted to it by the ever-sounding voice of tradition, echoed and re-echoed from age to age by its apostolically-ordained ministers; all within it we shall find to be beautiful consistency and harmonious order, all bright and radiant as the sun—without it all is disorder, confusion, and impenetrable darkness! Yes, my friends, my respected Protestant friends, wafted by the breath of *tradition*, the only

favouring gale that could move it onward, that ever-blessed, ever-heavenly book, the *Bible*, comes floating majestically down the full and uninterrupted tide of time; aimed at, indeed, on the right hand and on the left by the darts of innumerable heretics at one time, and Deists at another; but still, thank God, as fresh, as vigorous in its course, as pure, as unmutilated, as entire, as it was the very day when it first issued forth with the stamp of *canonicity* on its head, from the third Council of Carthage, in the year of our Lord 398—from the third Council of Carthage, I say, *from the hands, the venerable hands of the assembled bishops and guardians of Christianity*, in the year, not 1839, but 398. [Sensation.] As to any verification of the inspired volume from the tongues of Protestantism, it is in vain to look for it; they can give no rule to discriminate inspired writings from those which are apocryphal, but that which is given by the Roman poet, wherein he teaches the method of discriminating good verses from the bad ones, to wit:—

“*Legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et aure.*”

That is, if I may adapt it paraphrastically to the subject in hand:—

“A well-tuned ear is the sole test to know,
What sounds are earthly—what of heavenly flow.”

And now, my friends, you may remember that some evenings ago, my learned antagonist, who has taken great pains in ransacking every Catholic writer that has said a word against us, came with copious extracts from Cardinal Baroni-
nius, an excellent Catholic, whom my friend ingeniously tries to insinuate I threw “overboard,” though he (the cardinal) has most decidedly thrown all Calvinists overboard. My friend endeavoured to persuade

you that Cardinal Baronius had actually acknowledged that the Church of God had gone to sleep, and that there was a cessation of all pure teaching in the Church of God during the tenth century. I took the pains of consulting his work (the work of Baronius), to see if there was any period of time when the Catholic Church did not abound, and superabound, with bright ornaments, in point of sanctity and purity of life, of true piety, and exemplary virtue; and I find his books replete with the names of saints even in the very age when the Pope was bad, and when many of the cardinals were corrupted. I find saints there, such as I will oppose before the whole world, and such as shall put to the blush all the saints of the Covenant, that ramble over your Scotch boasted mountains. [Laughter.] Saints, my friends, in Catholic annals, such as John Wesley, the father of one of your sects of Methodism, has described, where he says, in his book called "Popery Calmly Considered:—"

"Several of them (the Papists) have attained to as high a pitch of sanctity as human nature is capable of arriving at."

But now, let us listen to Baronius, who bursts out at the end of his narrative of the tenth century, into the following eloquent apostrophe to the reader!

"Ita planè contemplari licet Dei ecclesiam hujus millenari curriculo circumductam unius instar diei, in quo ne ad momentum quidem reliquerit eam sol justitiæ, Christus, qui sicut ille sol ad hoc creatus est ut præsit diei, ad hoc factum est Verbum Caro, ut præsit ecclesiæ; sed fortius istud, siquidem dicit, Cælum et terra transibunt, verba autem mea non transibunt. Sive igitur ecclesiam vidisti luce clarescere, sive

tenebris obscurari, nunquam tamen eandem (si sapis) fuisse dixeris sine Christo ecclesiam, aut sine ecclesia Christum, sed quod sit in Christo semper ecclesia, et in ecclesia Jesus Christus, heri et hodie ipse et in mille sæcula.—Heb. xiii." *Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. xvi. *Luca*, p. 399.—*King's Library, British Museum.*

"Thus are we enabled, in one clear view, to contemplate the Church of God circling its orbit of a thousand years, like the transit of a single day, during which whole period it was never even for the *space of a single moment* forsaken of the Sun of Justice, Christ, who, in the same manner as the sun above was created in order to rule the day, so was the Word made flesh, in order to rule over the Church; ay, and still more evidently, inasmuch as he says, 'The heavens and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' Whether, therefore, you have seen the Church beaming with splendour or obscured by darkness, yet never, if thou art wise, wilt thou say, that the Church was ever without Christ, or that Christ was ever without the Church; but, on the contrary, you will exclaim, 'That in Christ the Church always was, and in the Church *Jesus Christ*, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'—*Heb. xiii. 8.*"

But the grand question, after all, for you to ponder upon, my Protestant friends, is, "Are you members of the Catholic Church mentioned so emphatically in the Apostles' Creed?" You that have permitted your minds to be whirled along so delightfully by the oratorical flourishes of my very ingenious opponent, the grand question, I say, for you to consider is, Whether we, when we go home this evening, when prostrate on our knees before God, can say, "*I believe in*

the Holy Catholic Church?" I shall say it this evening with a safe and quiet conscience. May yours give you no remorse, my friends, when *you* say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." It is a plain argument, which I have put over and over again, and I must repeat it once more, in order that it may sink the more deeply into your hearts before we part this evening. My friend tells me that all sects say theirs is the Catholic Church. Well, so I say of my Church. But why does not then the claim of any one of them correspond to the test which in the fourth century Augustine gave of the Catholic Church? He tells you that the Donatists overspread all Africa, and were almost equally numerous with the Catholics; they had churches and chapels in every part of the world, and when you ask them their title, they all call themselves the Catholic Church. "Now," says he, "I will show you a test, whereby you may prove the genuineness of the Catholic religion—prove that that glorious title appertains to you alone, to whatever quarter of the world fortune may direct your steps. It is this: Upon entering any city where the Donatists have churches or chapels, and where Catholics have them also, inquire, as a stranger to the place, of any Donatist you may meet, the way to the Catholic Church; and, strange to say," observes the saint, "though they all maintain, in theological disputation, theirs to be the Catholic Church, yet, without hesitation, they immediately point out *the true Catholic walls*."

Now, this test of St. Augustine holds good at the present day, and will hold good to the consummation of this world. Let a Catholic foreigner, upon his arrival in London, stop a Protestant, meeting him in

Oxford-street, and say, "Sir, I am a stranger in London; have the kindness to direct me to the Catholic chapel?" "Oh, certainly I will;" and he accordingly directs him to the nearest chapel. "Thus," says Augustine, "the Catholic Church will ever be distinguished from all heretics—and why? Because we are called Catholics by *ourselves* and by our *enemies*." Oh, my friends, I have known the holiest men and women, that abominated our Church, converted merely by deep reflection on that one single article. And there is another circumstance which I have observed, my friends: What is the reason of this extraordinary virulence against the Catholic Church? Why are societies formed to suppress its progress, and to denounce its "idolatry and its blasphemy?" If my friend has truth on his side, and were really "panting for the salvation of his benighted fellow Catholics," would he taunt and reproach them in such a satiric flood of Scotch virulence? [Confusion.]

JOHN KENDAL, Esq., Catholic chairman, rose to order.

It is nothing else, gentlemen; I am accustomed to plain language; I declare that if it were possible that he had used strong argument likely to shake the faith of any Catholic, I should have been afraid of my own feeble defence; whereas I have told him before, and I repeat it again, I have burned up all his arguments *like chaff*; I have left them *neither root nor branch*; yea, I have dashed all his arguments, in succession, one after another, on the rock of ages, the Catholic Church. I have scattered them, and broken them to pieces. [Renewed confusion.] But I say, my friends, if he had had power of argument sufficient to make an impression on the heart of any unenlightened

Catholic, still every tone of his voice, every gesture, every look, would have alienated that Catholic from that sect which he professes to belong to. "*Keep me from the house of gall,*" would have been the exclamation of the Catholic; keep me from that deadly, unmitigably virulent sect; keep me from those monsters of hypocrisy, who, whilst they pretend to be solicitous for my conversion and salvation, are mocking and galling me by every opprobrious epithet which their malignant imaginations can suggest to them.

And now, to answer another observation of my reverend opponent, let me say a few words concerning the supremacy of St. Peter, and his lawful successors—a column of Christian faith in every age, which the arm of my antagonist has so feebly endeavoured to shake.

Tertullian, I find, in the year of our Lord 199, exclaims, "If thou thinkest heaven is closed, recollect that *the Lord left the keys thereof to Peter*, and through him to the Church."—*Scorpuici*, c. x. p. 830. *Rotodami*, 1662.

Again, I hear, a little before *the blessed Reformation*—namely, in the year of our Lord 203—Origen exclaiming, in reference to the words, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," &c., exclaiming in the following words—"And truly, if the words of the Gospel be attentively considered, we shall there find that the last words were common to Peter and the others; *but that the former, spoken to Peter*, imported a great distinction and superiority."—*Orig. tom. xiii., Com. in Mat.*, p. 613. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1643.

My friend has told you that St. Cyprian denied the supremacy of St. Peter. I did not expect to meet

with such a statement concerning the illustrious Cyprian; but as I have brought a little pocket volume of mine, which constitutes one of my delights in this earthly pilgrimage, the letters of that glorious saint and martyr, St. Cyprian, I shall therefrom read, for the benefit of my learned opponent, a few short extracts, to see whether St. Cyprian, who flourished A.D. 248, acknowledged the supremacy of the Church or not. But, my friends, is it possible, let me ask you, that in the year 248, when Cyprian lived, and when so many other saints and martyrs lived, and left such glorious testimony of their adherence to the Pope, that he should have arisen in rebellion against him, and have denied his supremacy? Even from this passage I think we shall be able to collect enough to overturn the position of my friend.

"Deus unus est, Christus unus, una ecclesia, *et cathedra una*, supra petram Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui aut sacerdotium novum fieri præter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest."

"There is one God, one Christ, one Church, *one chair*, founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock. No other altar can be erected, no other priesthood can be instituted, but the one altar and the one priesthood."

Again—"Adulterum, impium, sacrilegium est quodcumque humano furore instituitur, dispositio humana violetur."

"Every institution that is engendered by the madness of man in violation of this divine economy, is adulterated, is impious, is sacrilegious."—*St. Cyp. Epist. ad plebem de quinque Presbyteris Schismaticis*.

But here, methinks, I hear my reverend antagonist exclaim, "Ay, but mark, St. Cyprian says, 'one

chair founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock ;' he does not say founded on *Peter*." In reply to this frivolous surmise, let Cyprian speak himself :—

"Christ addresses Peter (Matt. xvi. 18)—'I say to thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' He that doth not hold this unity of the Church, can he think that he holds the faith? He that opposes and withstands the Church, can he think that he is in the Church?"—*St. Cyp. de Unit. Ecc.* pp. 194, 195. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1726.

But really, now that I am upon this topic, it is worth while to consult the learned Mr. Kirk, in order to see whether these fathers, whom my friend describes as perpetually *knocking their heads against one another*, but who, as I contend, are in one Catholic indivisible body, for ever knocking their heads against him (Mr. Cumming) and all the advocates of many-headed Protestantism ; it is worth while, I say, to ask, What say they on the primacy of Peter ?

St. Irenæus, A.D. 177, says, "For to this Church (of Rome) *on account of its superior headship*, propter potiorem principalitatem, every other must have recourse ; that is, the faithful of all countries."

Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, and who ought consequently to have known something about the polity of the Church, tells us in the year 313 :—

"The kind providence of God conducts *Peter to Rome*, that powerful and great apostle, and, by his deserts, the chief of all the rest."—*Hist. Eccl.*, lib. ii. c. xiv. p. 63, *Cantabrigiæ*, 172 ; and yet, if we listen to the ecclesiastical Mr. Cumming, anno Domini 1840, *St. Peter never was at Rome !!!* [Laughter.]

St. Basil, A.D. 369, writes thus to Pope Damasus, on the distressed state of his Church :—

"We ask nothing new ; wherefore, if you are not at this time induced to aid us soon, all being subjected to the heretics, none will be found *to whom you may stretch out your hand*."—*Ep. Damasum. tom. iii. p. 164.* Ed. Bened. Paris, 1721, 22, 30.

Again—and most remarkable is the passage—I wish my Calvinistic opponent could show something of his Church half so old as the year 369—I should look at him with an eye of reverence. [A laugh.]

"Eustachius of Sebaste, being deposed at Melita, devised himself the means whereby to procure his restoration. What was proposed to him by the Roman bishop, and to what he agreed, we know not. We know only that he brought a letter, which when he had shown to the synod of Thyana, *he was reinstated in his see !*"—*Ep. 293, at 74, tom. iii. p. 406.*

But if St. Basil be not sufficiently clear upon the primacy of Peter, listen to the great St. Chrysostom, in the year 397. He writes to Innocent, the Roman bishop, after many proceedings against himself :—

"I beseech you to direct, that what has wickedly been done against me while I was absent, and did not decline a trial, should have no effect, and that they who have thus proceeded *may be subjected to ecclesiastical punishment, and allow me*, who have been convicted of no offence, to enjoy the consolation of your letters, and the society of my former friends."—*Ep. 1 ad. Innoc. tom. iii. p. 520,* Ed. Monfaucou, Paris, 1718-34.

Really, my reverend friend, Mr. Kirk, is a splendid benefactor to the Catholics of this country, in furnishing such valuable documents to crush

and confound our adversaries! But I must lay the book down, merely running my eye over it, and stating, that I find as I go on most copious extracts from St. Hilary, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nazianzum, St. James of Nisibis, St. Ephrem of Edessa, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Optatus of Milevis, St. Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Aeternus, St. Augustine of Alexandria, St. Leo the Great, St. Proclus, St. Isidore of Pelusium, and from the council of Ephesus, in the year 431, and the council of Chalcedon in the year 451; all acknowledging in the clearest, most explicit, and incontrovertible language, the uncontested primacy of Peter and his successors!

I shall conclude this discussion, my friends—as my opponent made one more attempt, and a feeble one it was, to overturn that eternal dogma of Transubstantiation—not by selecting, but by taking at random, the first extract from the fathers on the subject that shall present itself to my view on opening this immortal production of the Rev. Mr. Kirk, “The Faith of Catholics!”

Here it is—the great St. Hilary, in the year of our Lord 353! Listen most attentively:—

“Ipse enim ait, Caro mea vere est esca, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui edit carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo. De veritate carnis et sanguinis, non relictus est ambigendi locus; nunc enim et ipsius Domini professione et fide nostra vere caro est, et vere sanguis est. Et hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit. Anne hoc veritas non est? contingat planè his verum non esse, qui Christum Jesum verum esse Deum negent.”—*St. Hilary, Edit. Erasmi*, vol. i. p. 136.

Now, mark the words!

“IT IS HE (CHRIST) HIMSELF WHO SAYS, ‘MY FLESH IS MEAT INDEED, AND MY BLOOD IS DRINK INDEED. HE THAT EATS MY FLESH, AND DRINKS MY BLOOD, REMAINS IN ME, AND I IN HIM.’ THERE IS NO ROOM LEFT FOR DOUBTING OF THE FLESH AND THE BLOOD; FORASMUCH AS BY THE DECLARATION OF OUR LORD HIMSELF, AND BY WHAT OUR FAITH PROFFESSES, *IT IS TRULY FLESH AND TRULY BLOOD*. IS NOT THIS THE TRUTH? LET IT BE CALLED IN QUESTION BY THOSE ALONE WHO DENY THAT CHRIST JESUS IS TRUE GOD!”

There, my friends! there is glorious testimony to lower the towering crest of my learned opponent. What! shall I be told exultingly by my antagonist in the recapitulation of the exploits he has achieved since the commencement of this discussion, that, amongst others, he has, to use his own rather inelegant words, *smashed for ever the doctrine of Transubstantiation?*

But what says St. Hilary?

Why—“Let the doctrine be doubted by those alone who deny that Christ Jesus is true God.”

Talk after this of smashing—*there’s a smasher* for you, my learned, my reverend antagonist. [Sensation.] St. Hilary, you see, by this denunciation, sends men like you to join the ranks of the Unitarians. I adjure you then, my Protestant friends, who seek for truth, not conquest, most solemnly to weigh the meaning of those words which I have just read to you from the *magnum ævi sui lumen*, the *great light of his age*, as Erasmus designates him, from whose edition I have quoted it. Answer me within yourselves. Is it not too bad—is it not intolerable—is it not disgustingly repulsive, after such an illus-

trious testimony of such an early century as that which I have just laid before you, to hear a frothy declaimer in the nineteenth century bellowing out, over and over again, that Paschasius Radbert, forsooth, a poor obscure monk in the ninth century, invented the glorious dogma? I really think that, if the learned gentleman has not blushed for these ten years past, it is high time for a little distinguishable tinge to suffuse his cheek this evening; it is high time for his admirers to hang down their heads and blush around him. For tell me, my Protestant friends, when ye read this doctrine of Transubstantiation thus heralded forth by St. Hilary in the year of our Lord 353, can you upon any future occasion listen with patience, I should rather say with endurance, to the loud blast of the Calvinistic trumpet in the mouth of my reverend opponent, solemnly, gravely, pompously proclaiming that the doctrine taught by St. Hilary in the year 353, was invented by Paschasius Radbert, who was not born before the ninth century!!! The happy collocation, my friends, of this glorious extract, for which I am indebted to the blundering of my friend, will shine, I confidently trust, in the last part of this discussion, as a glittering jewel to the enlightenment of innumerable eyes; or, to speak less figuratively, to the conversion of innumerable souls to the Catholic religion. And as to you, my Catholic friends, by way of consolation for all the copious abuse which you have experienced so often during the course of this discussion,

for all the many galling, taunting epithets bestowed on you, of affected esteem for your benighted, wandering souls—[laughter]—join with me, *but in silence*—you silent, whilst I repeat thanks to the Almighty Inspirer, by whom I have been so powerfully assisted in this discussion, and whilst I exclaim boldly on the part of the Catholics, "*Parla victoria est*," "*The victory is won! the enemy of Catholicity is vanquished!*"

Rev. J. CUMMING and many others exclaimed, "No! no!" which was followed by applause and hisses. Order being with difficulty restored, votes of thanks were unanimously passed to the respective chairmen, who briefly returned thanks.

A gentleman then rose and said, "I have a resolution to submit, which I am perfectly sure you will all approve of. It is, That the thanks of this assembly be presented to the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society for the use of the present room." ["Hear, hear," and applause.]

GEORGE FINCH, Esq., then rose to state that the meeting was now concluded.

The audience, which entirely filled the spacious room, then retired in the greatest possible order, apparently highly gratified.

We certify that this Report is faithfully and correctly given:

J. CUMMING, M.A.

D. FRENCH,

Barrister-at-Law.

CHAS. MAYBURY ARCHER,
Reporter.

INDEX

TO THE

SPEECHES DELIVERED BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, A.M.

A.

Abel, the first Protestant, 152.
Absolution, judicial, as practised by Romish priests, objected against by sundry of the fathers, 9, 570, 571; declared by Augustine to be a blasphemous assumption, 567.
A'Becket, Thomas, his shrine at Canterbury, 234.
Access to God, Protestant doctrine of, 217.
Altar, the true, 151.
Angel of the Lord, is the Lord Jehovah, 231.
Antiquity, the true primitive, 258.
Apocrypha not inspired, 319; not sanctioned by fathers, 372.
Aquinas, Thomas, the seraphic doctor, decrees the extermination of heretics, 50; Romanists pray for grace to follow his doctrine, 75; measures the degree of idolatry due to various images, 564.
Altar, Protestant and Romish, 139.
Augustine asserts that Christ is figuratively eaten in the Sacrament, 593.
'Απαράβατον, translation of the word, 209.

B.

Babylon, exhortation to flee out of, and take shelter in Christ, 649, 650.
Baronius, his testimony against the corruptions of Popery, 407.
Bellarmine, Cardinal, admits that Scripture does not prove Transubstantiation, 53; acknowledges that the Protestant interpretation of John vi. is received by several writers of his Church, 49.
Bible, the, an appeal to it alone is not Deism, 60; English version of, admitted to be fallible, 80; the most accurate ever made, 318; glorious fulness of, 401—403; its inspiration proved by Rev. Hartwell Horne, 497—502; contrasted with Popery, 641; duty of studying, 642; sufficiency of, as a Rule of Faith and practice, 648.
Bible, Douay, and Authorized Version, respective translators of, 475; bears out Mr. Cumming's interpretations, 561; admits that Babylon means Rome, 563; Romish versions of, approximating more and more to Protestant, 529.
Blasphemy, superlative against Christ, 605.
Bolandists, their disgusting absurdities, 256.
Bossuet, his commendations of exterminators of heretics, 565.
Bolger, Mr., his bequest for masses, 183.

C.

Cain, the first Romish sacrificer, 152; his sacrifice an unbloody one, 174.
Christ, his human flesh did not come down from heaven, 37; if in the wafer, his body is broken up, 78; sufficiency of his one offering proved, 146—149; must suffer as often as offered, 148; treason against, to be met and repelled, 317; his advocacy all-sufficient, 325, 326; his body spiritually discerned in the Sacrament, 120.
Church cleansed by the Reformation; primitive, heresies and divisions existed in it, 508; scriptural and apostate, strong contrast between, 649.
Church of Rome, denies salvation out of her pale, 24; splendours of, her ceremonies do not feed the soul, 175; disgracefully visible, 114; treats the fathers like sycophants, 122; dependent on wine-merchant and baker for a true Sacrament, 125; teaches hard thoughts of God, 150; portrait of, by Sir E. Sandys, 400; teaches things contrary to Christ's commandments, 436; her fanaticism, 509; inconsistencies of, 510; her unity that of the Tipperary volunteers, 511; her infallibility hard to find, 536; gives a false gospel, dazzles, deludes and destroys, 607; her corruptions testified against by Baronius, Genebrard, and the Council of Pisa, 433.
Chrysostom shows the utility of reading Scripture, 474.
Cyprian against Papal supremacy, 640.
Confessional, iniquities of the, stated by Nolan and O'Crolly, 605, 606.

D.

Decretals of Gratian, their provision for the unmarried, 606.
Delahogue admits communion in both kinds till twelfth century, 80.
Discussion, the, its origin, 5.
Dominic, preposterous stories of, 256.
Dupin on ecclesiastical history, and on the ancient Liturgies, 171; his character, 594; his honesty, 363.

E.

Eagle, the, a type of the believer, 261.
Earth, the, canonized, 313.

Eucharist, the, how received by the Churches of England and Scotland, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Scottish and Westminster Confessions, 6, 7; Protestant doctrine concerning, held by various fathers, 9.

Evidence, internal, of the Holy Scriptures, 646.

F.

Fathers, the, fallible, contradictory, unauthorised, and their writings mutilated, 8; early, not in our possession, 254; several of, as Ambrose, Athanasius, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Irenæus, and Jerome, virtually under the Papal anathema, 255; afford strong testimonies against many of the Romish doctrines, as AUGUSTINE protests against praying in an unknown tongue, against Purgatory, against Mary's maternal assumptions, and against Priestly Absolutions, 566, 567. JEROME asserts that Scripture is the sole Rule of Faith; that, wherever true faith is found, there is the Church; that all Bishops are equal; that Christ is the Rock; that the Church is the assembly of all the saints; that the Apocrypha is uninspired; and that the judicial absolving power of the priests is usurped, 568—570. CHRYSOSTOM denies that Peter's person is the foundation; that any but God can forgive sins; that auricular confession is necessary; or that any minor intercessors are required. He also enforces the reading of Scripture, 571, 572. ORIGEN enforces the necessity of reading Scripture, and the spiritual meaning of eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, 572. ATHANASIUS protests against creature worship, 572. CYRIL of Alexandria against Purgatory, 573. CYRIL of Jerusalem rejects the Apocrypha, and makes Scripture the Standard of Faith, 573. JUSTIN MARTYR writes against the Mass and Transubstantiation, 573. EUSEBIUS calls the consecrated elements symbols, *ibid.* THEODORET denies that Angels are to be worshipped, and maintains Salvation by Grace, 574. GREGORY NAZIANZEN avers the true succession to be that of doctrine, *ibid.* TERTULLIAN makes the Sacrament the figure of Christ's body, *ibid.* AMBROSE denies the judicial power of the priesthood in forgiving sins, and contradicts Peter's supremacy, *ibid.* BASIL sets forth the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith, and salvation by grace, *ibid.* CYPRIAN is against Supremacy, Purgatory, Images, and Priestly Absolution, 575. HILARY denies Purgatory, and aid by the merit of others; and makes the Scripture the Rule of Faith, and salvation the free gift of God through faith, *ibid.* CLEMENS ROMANUS does the same, 576; and GREGORY THE GREAT denounces as Antichrist whosoever shall take the title of Universal Bishop, *ibid.*

Fathers, not unanimous, 124, 365, 369; modern divines have advantages over the, 176.

Fear of Hell pronounced by Pope Benedict XIV. a sufficient qualification for heaven, 596; considered by Mr. French as synonymous with fear of God, *ibid.*

I.

Idoltrous hymn, 270.

Idolatry, dreadful specimen of, quoted by Mr. French, 250.

Jael has the same title to be worshipped as Mary, 323.

Jerome, inconsistencies and absurdities of, 255.

Intermediate State, disproved by Isaiah lviii. 7; Eccles. xi. 3; John v. 24; 2 Cor. v. 1, 2; Luke ii. 29, 30; Luke xvi. 25; Acts vii. 56; Phil. i. 2, 3; Luke xxiii. 43—394, 395.

Justin Martyr, his description of scriptural public worship, 129; calls the Sacrament a commemoration, 140.

Interpretation, figurative, adopted by the Church of Rome, 31; the same in thirty-seven instances, 59; Augustine, Eusebius, and Origen quoted for figurative, 83.

Ignatius holds that faith is the Lord's flesh, and love his blood, 26.

Intention, doctrine of, 34.

ἱερεὺς, a sacrificing priest, never applied to Ministers of the Gospel, 181.

L.

Latria and Doulia, 227.

Liturgies, ancient, Dupin on, 172.

Liturgy of St. Peter, disproved by Dupin, *ibid.*; disproved by Cardinal Bona, 172; of SS. Mark and James, forgeries, *ibid.*

Λειτουργίᾳ, translation of the word, 636.

Λειτουργία, does not mean a Propitiatory Sacrifice, 178.

Luther, not quite rid of Popish corruptions, 614; no part of our Rule of Faith, 563.

Liguori, his singular merits in the way of self-flagellation, 601.

M.

Malachi i. 11, applied by Papists to the Mass—Douay translation, 220.

Mass, the Latin canon of, 171; of the Ethiopians or St. Matthew, a forgery, 172; asserted by the Canon of Trent to be an unbloody sacrifice, and to remit sins; but without shedding of blood there is no remission, 180; a cheat, or God's word deceives, 181; a propitiatory sacrifice retained by the Eastern Churches, 212; the dogma of, reasons for its spread, 212; if not wine but blood, strange it should intoxicate, 120; not apostolic, 125; if true, Christ has been offered up 400,000,000 times in forty years, 146; called a finite sacrifice by Bellarmine, 182; asserted to be a propitiatory sacrifice, by the Creed of Pius IV., by canons of Trent, and by Doyle's Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, 113.

Masses, prices of, 182; Mr. Bolger's bequest for, 183.
 Mother of God, when first applied to Mary, 171; remarks on the term, 211.
 Milner, Dean, his History mutilated in Mr. French's quotations, 465; his testimony against Popery, 467, 468.
 Missions of Romish Church, not scriptural, 480, 481.
 Missal Romanum, awful blasphemy of, 33, 34.
 Murder, wholesale, instigated by Pope Pius V., 611.
 Massacre of 20,000 Protestants, Papal exultation at, 613; of St. Bartholomew, 611; medal struck in commemoration of, 613.
 Μυστήριον, twenty-six times translated Mystery, only once Sacrament, in the Rhemish Testament, 560.

P.

Papists, invitation to them to receive the Gospel, 649, 650.
 Passover, the, a symbol, 32.
 Peter, a staunch Protestant, 228; supremacy of, overthrown by Augustine, 507.
 Paris, Archbishop of, with hundreds of his followers, worshipped the Goddess of Reason, 510.
 Patrick, St. his endless repetitions, 596.
 Philip, St. and the Devil, *ib.*
 Prayer to God, universal privilege and efficacy of, 232; to the Virgin, specimens of, 284, 285; blasphemous, 292—294; for the dead, not to be confounded with Purgatory, 358.
 Protestant unity, one hope, one faith, one baptism, one God, 511, 512.
 Protestants. Papalized, abandoned to the enemy, 283; too much Popery remaining among them, 646.
 Protestantism, its text, 153.
 Pope's denunciation of religious liberty, 605.
 Popes and Councils, reciprocal railings between, 559.
 Purgatory, not sanctioned by the fathers, 369; the true, 393; of St. Patrick, description of, 391; disproved by Heb. ix. 25; 1 John ii. 2; Rev. i. 5, 6—394.
 Priesthood, sacrificing, not ordained in the Christian Church, 143; argument against a succession of, from Heb. vii. 145.
 Prodigal Son, an encouragement to all, 261.
 Parable of the lost sheep, 287.

Q.

Quotation, mistakes in, made by Mr. French, 538.

R.

Rogicide, lawfulness and propriety of, proved by Gregory de Valentia, Jolet, Bellarmine, Sauvez, Salmeron, Lerarius, Molina, Emmanuel, the Seraphic Thomas, and a dozen others. Denied by Dr. Murray and Mr. French, 564.
 Relics, inventory of sundry curious and precious ones, 599.
 Rosa Sta., her marvellous doings, 600.

Romanism obliged to take the garb of Infidelity to wound Protestantism, 495.
 Rome shrouds the Sun of Righteousness from men's eyes, 152.
 Romish Doctors maintain that Christ's soul went to hell in the way of punishment, 558.
 Rule of Faith, Romish, not producible, 405; difficult to prove, 408; bulk and weight of, 470; contradictions of, 540; Protestant, produced, 405; not affected by differences of opinion among Protestants, as the Romish is by differences among themselves, 540; triumphant all-sufficiency of, 648.

S.

Salvation, full, free, and priceless, 222; as taught in the Romish Church, rests on a contingency. Truth, holiness, and justice, concur in the Gospel plan of salvation, 151.
 Saints in heaven, unable to hear prayer, 286; on earth, allowable to ask their prayers, 225.
 Scripture, its excellency as a Rule of Faith proved, by 2 Timothy iii. 16, 17; Psalm xix. 7; John v. 39; John xx. 31—440, 441; blessed nature of, proved by its effects, 646; glory of, compared to the sun, 647.
 Sandys, Sir Edwin, his opinion misrepresented, 399—401.
 Success in making proselytes no test of truth, 437.
 Scape-goat, 218.
 Septuagint preferred to the original Hebrew, by Mr. French, 639.
 Spirits, seven, before the throne, Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen on them, 230, 231.

T.

Tractarians, 283.
 Traditions, corrupted, 433; contemned by Matt. xv. 1, 2, 3; Mark vi. 5, 6, 8; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; 2 Thess. ii.—439.
 Transubstantiation, doctrine of, as established by the Canons and Catechism of the Council of Trent and Creed of Pope Pius IV., 5, 6; first started by Rhadbert Pascasius in the ninth century. Duns Scotus admits it was only rendered necessary to believe it by the decree of the Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215. Duremetus, Bishop of Meaux, said he would not believe it, as the Church did not compel him, 14; disproved by Acts iii. 21; Matt. xxvi. 11; and 2 Cor. v. 16; also by Matt. xxiv. 26—10, 11; if true, Christ's body is not a real body, 12; evidence of senses against, 28, 29; absurdities and impossibilities involved in the principle of, 29; so anomalous, that only the most positive and inevitable declaration of God's word could establish it, 54; Cardinals Camarensis, Roffensis, Cajetan, and Scotus, against it, 85; awfully degrading to Christ, 87; Isidore and Augustine quoted, against Transubstantiation, 215; disproved by a passage quoted by Mr. French from the Book of Common Prayer in support of it, 115.

Translation, Protestant, unjustly cavilled at, 475; Douay, dishonesty of, 477.

Trent, Catechism of, asserts that bones and nerves are contained in the wafer, 77; Council of, admits various interpretations of the fathers, 85; commands Invocation of Saints, 224.

U.

Union of Church and State approved by Pope Gregory XVI., 597.

Unity of Protestant Confessions, 598.

V.

Virgin Mary, specimens of blasphemous worship addressed to her, 284, 285, 292—294; set forth as Mediator, 315; her blessedness, rightly shown by Augustine, 324; horrible blasphemy in praise of, 603.

W.

Walthen and the Devil, 603

REPORT
OF A
MEETING OF PROTESTANT LAYMEN
AT HAMMERSMITH,

For presenting a Testimonial

TO THE

REV. JOHN CUMMING, M.A.

FOR HIS DEFENCE OF PROTESTANT CHRISTIANITY AT THE
LATE DISCUSSION.

(Extracted from the London Newspapers.)

REPORT

MEETING OF PROTESTANT LAYMEN
AT ALBANY, N.Y.

HELD AT THE REQUEST OF THE

REV. JOHN CUNNING, M.A.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CO-OPERATING WITH THE
LATE LAYMEN

PROTESTANT EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE.

ON Monday evening, July 1st, we were present at the truly interesting and gratifying meeting held at Hammersmith, by the Protestants of that place, for the purpose of presenting to the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, Minister of the Scottish Church, Crown-court, Covent Garden, a Polyglot Bible, as an expression of the gratitude and satisfaction felt by the Protestant inhabitants of Hammersmith, at his most decisive overthrow of the errors of the Church of Rome, and triumphant defence of the great and glorious truths of the Reformation, in his controversy during eleven nights with one of the most subtle and learned champions of Popery, DANIEL FRENCH, Esq. Barrister-at-law, and member of "the Catholic Institute."

At seven o'clock GEORGE FINCH, Esq., M.P. took the Chair.

After prayer, the representatives of the Church, the Wesleyans, and the Independents, Messrs. Walker, Lovely, and Salter, who were present at the Discussion, laid on the table a magnificent Polyglot Bible, in ten languages, superbly gilt and bound in morocco, and with the following inscription embossed in gold letters on the binding :—

TO THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, M.A.,
FROM THE PROTESTANTS OF HAMMER-
SMITH, FOR HIS ABLE AND SUCCESS-
FUL DEFENCE OF THEIR CAUSE IN
HIS LATE CONTROVERSY ON CERTAIN
POINTS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC
FAITH WITH DANIEL FRENCH, ESQ.
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

Mr. FINCH commenced his address by stating that the object for which they were assembled was one of the most truly Christian and delightful that could be imagined. They were about to express their esteem and affection towards a Christian brother, and thus to display that spirit of peace and love which was characteristic of the children of God. They were not only about to manifest their regard for a Christian brother, but for a Christian *minister*, one of the ambassadors of God, whose high and holy office was entitled to the veneration of every true disciple of their Lord and Saviour. That minister, too, had the privilege of belonging to the Church of Scotland, a Church which from the era of the Reformation till the present day had been distinguished for her zeal for the propagation of gospel truth, and her uncompromising protest against Romish error. It was most gratifying, too, to think that Christians of various denominations had united together to present a token of their affection to Mr. Cumming, thus evidencing that Reformed Catholics who had one common faith, one Lord, one Spirit, and one God and Father of all, could coalesce in one common bond of union, when their religion was endangered or assailed. The originating cause of the meeting afforded to him fresh satisfaction; it was neither more nor less than their admiration of the temper,

spirit, and ability with which his excellent and truly Christian friend had defended their common faith against the subtleties and misrepresentations of Rome. The present which they had selected to confer upon Mr. Cumming harmonized with the whole proceeding. In presenting to him a Bible, they proclaimed that "the Bible, and the Bible only, was the religion of Protestants." They recognised it as their armoury for weapons of offence and defence, as their chief earthly possession, and as the treasury of the Christian Minister. They thus honoured the Holy Spirit, who had composed the Holy Volume—Jesus, who was its sum and substance, and of whom it testified,—and the God and Father of the Bible and of the Church, who in its holy pages had made known to them his wonderful love in giving his dear Son to die for them and for their salvation. He (Mr. Finch) would not detain the meeting with further observations at present, but he called upon Mr. Walker to present the Bible to Mr. Cumming.

Mr. WALKER rose as the representative of the Church of England and congratulated Mr. Cumming on the present occurrence. He said that at first he was afraid of the discussion, and was among those who preferred to try to prevent it; but his experience of its results—his strong impression of the meekness and faithfulness, and complete victory of the Protestant advocate, had, with other reasons, convinced him that it had been of essential service to the people of Hammersmith. He concluded a judicious and most appropriate speech by tendering the Bible to Mr. Cumming, accompanied with his prayers that every blessing might attend his exertions in the Protestant cause.

Mr. LOVELY, as a representative

of the Wesleyans, followed up the observations of his friend by a very animated address. He expressed the profit and pleasure he had reaped throughout the late important discussion, and the great satisfaction he had in presenting the best of all books.

The Rev. J. CUMMING rose, and stated that he found it not so easy to give utterance to the deep sense of gratitude he felt, not merely for their costly and elegant present, but for the feeling, unanimity, and to him hitherto unknown kindness which dictated the gift. He owed much of the success that had followed his humble though laborious exertions to the profound attention and uninterrupted order maintained by the audience that was night after night crowded within those walls; to the indefatigable exertions of those gentlemen who had just spoken; and to the efforts especially of his honourable friend who occupied the chair, whose munificent contributions to the Protestant cause were among the least of his good deeds. Mr. Finch, he observed, had sat up to an early hour many a morning, copying out those valuable Greek and Latin extracts which were to him of essential value, and in other respects, to which his presence did not allow him to refer, he assisted him. To Mr. Finch's Benedictine Edition of the Fathers he expressed himself deeply indebted; but, above all, he felt that the chief spring and source of the triumph of truth was, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

The Reverend Gentleman next went over the various assumptions of the Roman Catholic faith, disproving the extravagant claims of Popery, and contrasting powerfully with them the distinctive characteristics of the Gospel. He showed next

that the prevalence of Popery taught them many important lessons. It proved the divine guardianship of the sacred volume. The Romish Church, he continued, had had recourse to every expedient to injure or to conceal the sacred volume. She had corrupted it by pestilential notes—she had concealed it by an unknown tongue—she had tried to neutralize its virtues by the accession of the Apocrypha and its immoral rescripts—and notwithstanding, this Book retained its beauty, its harmony, its vitality, its primeval integrity. [Hear, hear, hear.]

The prevalence of Popery taught them the divine nature of the Gospel. Nothing but the Gospel could have survived the pressure and the persecutions to which it had been subjected. It was struck at by the heresy of Arius in the fourth century, and it was long crushed and smothered by the over-eclipsing superstition of the Roman heresy. But it heard, even in its captivity, the voice of him who summoned Lazarus from the grave, as that voice poured through the organs of the Reformation, and came fresh from its retreats, casting off the incrustations of corruption and the cerecloths and trappings of its tomb, and looked once more abroad upon the wide world, unshorn of its splendour, “in the beauties of holiness” with the dew of its own bright and holy morn. [Hear, hear, hear.] The prevalence of the Roman superstition taught them also the fearful depravity of the human heart. His learned opponent had objected to their translation of a passage in Jeremiah, urging that they wilfully overcharged it in order to establish the dogma of Calvinism, that man’s heart is corrupt. He had showed that, according to the usages of

the Church of Rome in other passages, their translation “desperately wicked” was not strong enough, “malignant so as to be incurable, even unsearchably so,” was its better rendering. But if they wished a more powerful proof of the wickedness of man’s nature, they had only to look at that mystery of iniquity, which lorded it over Europe for centuries, whose priests, like the locusts of Egypt, had made the garden of the Lord a barren wilderness, and every kingdom an Aceldama. In Popery, he saw Scripture prophecy fulfilled, Scripture and the Gospel proved to be divine, man corrupt, and Satan ever active. [Hear, hear.] He rejoiced that his arduous labours had given satisfaction—he prayed that God might own and bless them yet more—he hoped soon to meet them again; and, after an hour’s address, sat down amid much applause.

Mr. SALTER, the representative of the Independents, rose, and in a very neat speech moved a vote of thanks to the honourable Chairman, whose kindness, impartiality, and attention during the late discussion had attracted universal notice.

Mr. FINCH observed in reply, that he fully agreed with the sentiments of Mr. Walker, and that he deemed it to be an unspeakable honour and privilege to be employed in any Christian work; and he would add further, that he preferred being engaged in such labours of love in a subordinate office, and as it were as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, for he felt himself to be most unworthy of the distinguished position in which he had been placed as Chairman of the present meeting. They had now arrived at the conclusion of the proceedings connected with the discussion which had taken place

between Mr. Cumming and Mr. French; but although it could not be said to be a conclusion in which nothing was concluded, he trusted that it was only a preface to their strenuous and persevering resistance to the incursion of Roman Catholic principles. Let them not be deceived, and imagine that because the Romish emissaries had been foiled in their first efforts, they would desist from their undertaking. If some of their advocates, like Mr. French, preferred the battle-field, others were more expert in sapping and mining, in wiles and stratagems: the ambition of Rome was insatiable and boundless; she regarded the whole of Great Britain as her patrimony; and nothing short of re-possessing the whole kingdom would satiate the cravings of her appetite for dominion. She had recourse to every expedient to forward her designs. Sometimes she enlarged upon her apostolicity, antiquity, unity, and catholicity; sometimes she ventured upon a defence of her creed; sometimes she threw a veil over the more unsightly portions of her religious system, and endeavoured to prove that the differences between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Catholic creeds were of no real moment; she dropped the more serious charge of heresy, and tenderly inquired whether it were worth while, for the sake of such trivial discrepancies, to rend the seamless coat of Christ; at other times she enlarged upon the failings of the Reformers, and pointed to Henry the Eighth as the father of the Reformation, and libelled the doctrine of Protestants as an unholy doctrine which discarded good works; sometimes she contrasted the differences and disputations of Protestants with her own much-vaunted unity; in point

of fact, she left no means untried—the views of the Reformers were maligned, the corruptions and superstitions of Romanism were concealed, history was falsified, she claimed all the fathers and the universal voice of antiquity, and by her subtleties, and assumptions, and fallacies, not unfrequently succeeded in seducing the unwary, and obtaining proselytes to her deadly creed. When these methods of persuasion failed, she had recourse to other expedients—she appealed to literary or architectural enthusiasm, and to our ancestral affections. She reminded us that when our Saxon ancestors were immersed in the most barbarous idolatry, Augustine was commissioned by Pope Gregory to visit Britain, and that he planted therein the standard of the cross, and rescued our ancestors from paganism. She admonished us also of the services rendered to literature by Pope Nicholas and his successors, and she pointed to the venerable and colossal cathedrals of England as visible monuments of Roman Catholic piety. Although the hour was late, perhaps the meeting would pardon him if he hazarded a few remarks upon each of these topics. [Hear, hear.] That a very considerable portion of our Saxon ancestors were converted by Pope Gregory's missionaries, it would be preposterous to deny; but the question which immediately presented itself to them was, whether, in the event of their embracing the Romish religion of *that* day, they should escape the anathemas of the Council of Trent? Most assuredly they would still be exposed to them. Pope Gregory repudiated the notion of an Episcopal Supremacy over the whole Christian Church, and hence in this fundamental article we should still be open to the charge of heresy.

Other important differences existed between the Roman Catholicism of the sixth century and that which was confirmed by the Council of Trent. At the former period auricular confession, although much practised, was not generally exacted by a decree of the Church. The Bible, although too little read, was not regarded as a dangerous book, if indiscriminately perused in the vulgar tongue. Transubstantiation was not then an article of faith, for a Saxon homily of the ninth century still existed, which was directly at variance with it. The doctrines of grace had not been proscribed by the Trentine false gospel. There were in the sixth century no Papal indulgences, or jubilees, or canonization of saints; and the monstrous temporal assumptions of the Popes, which are still retained by them and their councillors, and which occasioned so much strife, confusion, and irreligion in Christendom, were then unheard of. But even if the religion of Pope Gregory and his missionary Augustine had been identically the same as the Roman Catholicism of the present day, were modern Protestants under so strong an obligation of gratitude to them that they were bound to prefer a corrupt to a pure Christianity? If they owed so much to Pope Gregory, who presented to them Christianity in a corrupt form, although far less corrupt than modern Romanism, how much more were they indebted to the Reformers, who presented it to them in its apostolic purity! and if they were under a debt of gratitude to St. Augustine, how much more were they indebted to the King of Saints, who had revealed himself to them in the full effulgence of his glory! But even if, for argument's sake, Protestants assented to the antichristian position, that

converts were in all cases, and under all circumstances, bound undeviatingly to adhere to the vices as well as to the excellences of the creeds presented to them by their first missionary teachers, this concession would be fatal to the advocates of the Roman Catholic Church. For if the Saxon ancestors of the English people were plunged in the most lamentable idolatry, the spiritual condition of the ancient Romans was no less disastrous; and if the former were bound to receive, unaltered, Augustine's creed, the latter were bound, by an equal obligation, to receive, in its unmutated integrity, the religion of Peter and Paul. Now here Protestants were prepared to enter into covenant with Rome; and here they were ready conditionally to pledge themselves to an assimilation of their creed to that of Rome. If the Roman Church would only resume the religion of the apostles Peter and Paul, in all its purity and simplicity, and cut off all that was extrinsic to it, then the Protestants would pledge themselves to adopt, instantaneously, the Romish creed. [Hear, hear.] Having said this much respecting the conversion of England by Augustine, he (Mr. Finch) would say a few words upon the papal patronage of literature. The subject might be dismissed without much comment; for could any man in his senses seriously contend that the patronage of literature was an evidence of orthodoxy? If the patronage of literature was to be the standard, the religion of the heathen Emperor Augustus had paramount claims to that of the apostles. In the fourth century the apostate Julian might, upon the score of his patronage of literature, have justified his apostasy. In the ninth and tenth centuries the Caliphs of Bagdat, and other Mahomedan kings, were the great patrons of

literature, whilst Christendom was buried in comparative ignorance; and hence, in those days, Mahomedanism, according to this standard, was, unquestionably, preferable to Christianity. Ludovico the Moor, and Pope Sextus the Fourth, were among the most distinguished patrons of literature; and did that legalize the cold-blooded assassinations of which they were guilty? The monster Henry VIII. was a celebrated patron of literature, and so was Louis XIV., who commenced his reign with the desolation of the Palatinate, and who subsequently perpetrated the most cruel atrocities in the persecution of the French Protestants. The infidel Frederic the Great of Prussia was a patron of literature. But when infidels, heathens, apostates, tyrants, murderers, could all make the same boast of having patronized literature, what possible connexion could there be between the profession of a pure creed and the patronage of literature? Among the literati themselves were found Heathens, Greeks, Roman Catholics, Protestants, who were deemed heretics by Rome, and infidels, Voltaire, Gibbon, D'Alembert, &c.; so that nothing could be more preposterous than the endeavour to build the orthodoxy of Roman Catholicism upon the papal patronage of literature. In reply to a monk, whose arguments and conduct were highly irreligious, Luther is reported to have described him as being not only satanized, but sub-satanized and super-satanized; and it might with equal truth be stated that the advocate who claimed for Rome the character of sanctity, by reason of the papal patronage of literature, was not only stultified, but sub-stultified, and super-stultified.—[Much laughter.]—He would now, with the permission of the meeting, and if they were not quite

wearied—[No, no,]—proceed to animadvert upon the third point. Roman Catholics were wont to point to our splendid cathedrals, and to adduce from their magnificence a strong presumptive evidence in favour of the piety of the churchmen who erected such stately fabrics for the worship of God.

A few weeks ago, when he entered the library of the Athenæum Club, the librarian directed his attention to a book which had recently been placed upon one of the tables. The frontispiece consisted of a beautiful architectural design, and he opened the volume expecting to find it to be a treatise upon Gothic architecture. Great was his surprise when he discovered that it contained a most fulsome panegyric upon the religion of Rome, and a most virulent attack upon that of the Reformers. The author of the work, Mr. Pugin, had been so far deluded by his architectural enthusiasm as to become a Roman Catholic; and he (Mr. Finch) had been informed that his wife, Mrs. Pugin, had, within the last month, also been so infatuated as to desert the Reformed Catholic faith, and to enter the pale of Romanism. The following was an extract from Mr. Pugin's treatise, which was entitled, "Contrasts, or a Parallel between the Architecture of the 15th and 19th Centuries, by A. W. Pugin."—"But who can regard those stupendous edifices of the middle ages (the more special objects of this work) without feeling this observation in full force? Here every portion of the sacred fabric bespeaks its origin; the very plan of the edifice is the emblem of human redemption," &c.

"Yes, it was, indeed, the faith, the zeal, and, above all, the unity of our ancestors that enabled them to conceive and raise those wonderful fabrics that still remain to excite

our wonderful admiration. They were erected for the most solemn rites of Christian worship, when the term Christian had but one signification throughout the world, when the glory of the house of God formed an important consideration with mankind, when men were zealous for religion, liberal in their gifts, and devoted to her cause; they were erected ere heresy had destroyed faith, schism had put an end to unity, and avarice had instigated the plunder of that wealth that had been consecrated to the service of the Church. When these feelings entered in, the spell was broken, the architecture itself fell with the religion to which it owed its birth, and was succeeded by a mixed and base style devoid of science or elegance, which was rapidly followed by others, till at length, regulated by no system, devoid of unity, but made to suit the ideas and means of each sect as they spring up, buildings for religious worship present as great incongruities, varieties, and extravagances, as the sects and ideas which have emanated from the new religion which first wrought this great change."

Such was the substance of Mr. Pugin's argument; and if it was more characterized by plausibility than logic, it was not wholly unworthy of comment. The readiest and the most conclusive mode of considering these questions was by examining them in the light of the apostolic age. When Christianity was first promulgated by the apostles and the evangelists, mankind might be said to be divided into three portions, heathens, Jews, and Christians. The heathens at Rome were addressed by the Apostle Paul towards the close of his mission. Now, if religious architecture had in these days been the test of religious truth, which party could have preferred

the strongest claims? The heathen world, in all parts of the habitable globe, were celebrated for the magnificence of their temples. Upon the present occasion it would, perhaps, be advisable to restrict their observations to ancient Rome. That celebrated Roman Catholic writer, the late Mr. Eustace, had given a very graphic description of the architectural wonders of ancient Rome. From his statement it appeared that ancient Rome contained no fewer than 420 temples; and of these he would present the meeting with the description of the most splendid, though not the most distinguished by the vastness of its dimensions:—"The temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, though not the largest in Rome, was from its destination the most sacred, from its site the most conspicuous, and from its furniture and decorations the most opulent. It was filled with the treasures of vanquished monarchs, adorned with the plunder of palaces and temples, and enriched with the spoils of the conquered world. It was, in fact, the treasury of Rome, the deposit of the accumulated triumphs of ages of victory and conquest. Crowns, shields, and statues of gold, the offerings of kings, emperors, and heroes, blazed on all sides, and adorned with equal profusion the interior and exterior of this palace of dominion—this throne of empire and religion. Its threshold was bronze, but bronze doubly and triply gilt; the pediment, sides, and summit of the roof presented horses, chariots, heroes, and gods, the Roman eagle, and its attendant Victory, all of bronze, silver, or gold, glittering to the sun, and dazzling to the eyes of the spectator." Even our cathedrals must hide their diminished heads, when contrasted with the magnificence of this heathen temple; but what could the apostle Paul

exhibit in comparison with it? He could only point to his own "hired house," wherein he received such Jews and Romans as attended his ministry, and participated in his devotions; and what Christian would deny the ineffably superior spiritual glory of his temple over the proud fabric which was desecrated by Pagan idolatry?—[Hear, hear.]—But here it would perhaps be remarked by Roman Catholic advocates, that an immeasurable difference prevailed between the erection of temples to false gods, and the building of temples or cathedrals which were consecrated to Jehovah. He would meet them upon that ground, and pass on to the second temple at Jerusalem. Everybody was acquainted with the surpassing splendour of that enormous edifice. It was amply described by Josephus; it greatly surpassed in its magnificence the temple of Solomon, and was, perhaps, the finest temple that ever was elevated for the service of true or false religion. Even the Lord's disciples were dazzled by its brilliancy. In the 24th chapter of St. Matthew it is written, "And Jesus went out and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to show him the buildings of the temple." Now let the meeting mark our blessed Saviour's reply. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." That part of the subject might be dismissed in a few words. Who built the second temple of the Jews? Herod the Great. For what was that unhappy monarch notorious? For the murder of the *Innocents*. For whose gratification did he build the temple? To make himself popular with the Jews. How did they evince their religious sentiments?

By the rejection and crucifixion of the Saviour. Those facts unequivocally testified that there was no inseparable connexion between the building of beautiful temples for the service even of the true God, and spiritual piety. Mr. Pugin, however, would perhaps object to arguments deduced from Pagan or Jewish delinquency, and he would urge that the English cathedrals were neither erected by the worshippers of false gods, nor by those who denied their Saviour. By whom then were the English cathedrals constructed? By the Norman and Italian clergy. Who introduced the Norman and Italian clergy into England? William the Conqueror, who, his enterprise having received the papal sanction, invaded our land, overthrew our liberties, covered it with desolation and misery, dispelled the greater part of the native clergy, because they confederated with the laity for the preservation of the nation's independence and freedom, and installed the Norman clergy in their room, who so raised the papal power in England, that in the 13th century Europe beheld King John on his knees as the Pope's vassal, and the barons excommunicated by the Pope for refusing to cancel Magna Charta. These reminiscences, which met them in the very threshold of their inquiry, were not seductive, nor were they pre-eminently calculated to advance the cause of British Romanism. But, after all, what was the state of the Roman Catholic Church when the principal English cathedrals were founded and built? The cathedral of Canterbury was founded by Bishop Lanfranc in 1073. The cathedral of York was begun in 1173. The cathedral of Winchester was commenced in 1079. The cathedral of Peterborough in 1118. The cathedral of Lincoln in 1118. What, then, was the moral

and religious condition of the Romish Church in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries? At the first retrospective glance they call to mind the haughty Hildebrand, who flourished in the latter part of the 11th century, and by his immeasurable ambition plunged Italy and Germany into wars, by which they were distracted or desolated for nearly three centuries. Gregory VII. elevated the papal power above that of emperors and kings; he laid claim to half the kingdoms of Europe; he excommunicated the Emperor of Germany, and kept him waiting without the gates of his palace during three days and three nights barefooted, and in the garb of a penitent. His successors trod in his footsteps. Kings and emperors discharged the humble office of the Pope's equerries, and held his bridle and his stirrups when he mounted his horse. In those days whole kingdoms were laid under interdict by the popes, all the offices of religion were suspended; even the dead were left disinterred, and the voice of religion was utterly silenced. It was then, too, that Europe was disgraced by the fanaticism of the crusades. Without dwelling upon the proceedings and outrages of the first hordes of fanatics who followed Peter the Hermit, and Walter the Penniless, and others, let them for a moment contemplate the proceedings of the first regular army of the crusades. If they followed them to Antioch, they perceived them wreaking their vengeance upon the Mahomedans, after the conflict had ceased, until their houses were filled with gore, and the streets streamed with blood; and when the work of slaughter was completed, they then abandoned themselves to the most lamentable excess and profligacy. They subsequently carried by assault Jerusalem, the sacred city.

What a strange mixture did they there exhibit of ferocity and devotion! No mercy was shown to the inhabitants; rivers of blood again defiled the streets; old and young, women with their infants at the breast, infidels and Jews, were immolated; and the work of carnage having been completed for a time, they presented themselves at the holy sepulchre, and offered up their thanksgivings to God—thus testifying, by their sanguinary deeds, how little they were under the dominion of the gospel of grace. This, it must be recollected, was styled the *holy war*. It would have been well for the Church of Rome in those ages, if the massacre of the infidels had been her only crime; but it was then that the mystical Babylon was displayed as literally *drunken* with the blood of the saints. Pope Innocent III. and his successors invoked the aid of the secular arm, and stimulated kings and princes to the crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenses.* Their cities were stormed, their country was ravaged; hundreds of them were consigned to the flames, and tens of thousands of them were slaughtered. After persecutions and proscriptions which continued for about forty years, the remnant of this devoted people, whose chief crime consisted in their opposition to Rome, were compelled to conceal themselves in the more retired parts of Languedoc, Switzerland, the north of Italy, Hungary, and Germany, until the era of the glorious Reformation, when they were enabled to emerge from their obscurity, and could again openly worship their God and Saviour in spirit and truth. [Applause.] Why need he (Mr. Finch) say more? Those ages were iron, by reason of their ferocity and profligacy; and

* Consult the celebrated Roman Catholic annalist, Raynaldus.

leaden, by reason of their spiritual blindness, and their ignorance of profane and sacred literature. But here the Roman Catholic apologist would, perhaps, interpose, and protest against a narrative which proceeded from the mouth of an opponent. Be it so. He would introduce them to a Roman Catholic witness, and be content to abide by his testimony. The witness whom he was about to present to them was no other than the great St. Bernard, one of the chiefest of the Roman Catholic saints, and the last of the fathers of the Church. To such a witness the most sensitive Roman Catholic could not object. First, he would read St. Bernard's description of the monks of the 12th century. (*St. Bernardi Abbatis Apologia ad Gulielm. Abbatem.* chap. ix.)

"Who in the beginning, when the monastic order commenced, would have believed that the monks would have arrived at such a state of indolence? How greatly do we differ from the monks who lived in the time of Anthony! They, of a truth, when at certain seasons they visited each other in the spirit of charity, received from each other the bread of the soul with such eagerness, that, almost forgetful of the nourishment of the body, they passed for the most part the whole day with their bodies fasting, but not with fasting minds. . . . But when we come together, to use the words of the apostle, 'This is not to eat the Lord's supper;' for there is *no one* who seeks or who administers the heavenly bread. Nothing is done respecting the Scriptures or the salvation of souls; but trifles and laughter prevail, and words are cast to the wind. At dinner the ears are as much fed with common talk, as the jaws with feasting; by which every one is so taken up, that there is no moderation in eating. Mean-

time dishes follow dishes, and for one dish of butcher's meat from which you abstain, two large fishes are introduced; and though you had enough of the first, when you begin with the second it seems as if you had not tasted the first. For all things are prepared by the cooks with so much diligence and art, that when four or five dishes have been devoured, the first don't stand in the way of the last, nor does satiety diminish the appetite. For the palate, seduced by new sauces, by degrees losing its power of distinguishing, is greedily renewed in its desires for other juices as if it was yet fasting. . . . Who can describe in how many ways (to say nothing of other things) eggs only are turned over and tormented; with what ingenuity they are turned inside out, turned over, liquified, hardened, contracted; and now they are served up fried, now roasted, now stuffed, now mixed together, now separately—and why are all these things done, except only to prevent nausea? The quality of the things, besides, is made to have such an outward appearance, as to be not less pleasing to the eye than to the palate. The eyes are allured by colours, and the palate by tastes; and the unhappy stomach, upon which the colours do not shine, and which the relishes do not soothe, being thus compelled to receive all things, is oppressed and overwhelmed, rather than refreshed.

"And what can I say respecting drinking of water? For all of us, the very instant we become monks, have weak stomachs, and neglect the necessary counsel of the apostle respecting the use of wine, the word 'little' which he introduced being, I know not why, left out. And I wish they were content with pure wine only. I am ashamed to mention it, but it is still more shameful to practise it; and if we are ashamed

to hear it, let us not be ashamed to correct it. You may see in one dinner three or four times the half-filled goblet brought in, until these different wines being rather smelt than drank, not so much swallowed as touched, one at length, after a sagacious and quick perception, is selected out of the many as being *the strongest*. But what is the custom which some monasteries are said to observe, viz. to drink at their assemblies, on the great festivals, wines mixed up with honey, sprinkled over with grains of perfume? Can we say that this is done on account of the weakness of their stomachs? I can see no other purpose in it than that they may drink more, and with greater enjoyment," &c. &c.

He (Mr. Finch) begged the meeting to observe St. Bernard's comments upon the outward splendour of the altars, and the furniture of the monkish chapels—(ch. xxii.) "The eyes are gluttled with relics covered with gold. When the little partitions are opened, a most beautiful form of a male or female saint is exhibited, and the more brilliant the colouring, the holier is the saint esteemed to be. Men run to kiss it, and they are invited to give; and beautiful things are more admired than sacred things are venerated. Hence, not crowns, but circular ornaments covered with jewels and surrounded with lamps, are placed in the churches; and for candlesticks, a sort of trees are set up, with great weight of metal, and fabricated with extraordinary art, and not less resplendent from the candles that are placed in them than from their gems. What do you think is sought for in all these things, the remorse of penitents, or the admiration of beholders? Oh, vanity of vanities, but not more vain than man!" (What would Mr.

Pugin think of what followed?) "The Church shines in her buildings, she is *wanting to the poor*; she covers her stones with gold, *she leaves her sons naked*. The eyes of the *rich* are served with the money of the *poor*. The curious are delighted, but *the wretched have no means of support*." So much for the monks.

The picture presented by St. Bernard of the immorality of the secular clergy was quite appalling. (*St. Bernardi Abbatis de conversione ad clericos*, chap. xx.) "We do not accuse, neither can we excuse all men. The Lord has reserved for himself many thousands; otherwise, unless their righteousness had been our excuse, and the Lord of Sabaoth had left us that holy seed, we should have been already overthrown like Sodom, and should have perished like Gomorrah. The Church appears to be extended; the most sacred order of the clergy, the number of brethren, has incalculably multiplied itself. But although, O Lord, thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast not increased its joy, since its merit has departed to the full as much as numbers have entered it. Everybody runs after holy orders, and men assume, without reverence or reflection, that ministry which is revered even by the angelic spirits. Those fear not to take the sign of the heavenly kingdom, nor to wear the crown of the heavenly empire, in whom avarice reigns, ambition rules, pride is enthroned, iniquity resides, luxury has the government; with whom, also, so unhappy is their condition, the abomination would appear between the walls, if, according to the prophecy of Ezekiel, we were to dig down the wall, and behold what *inspires horror* in the house of God. For in addition to fornications, adulteries, incests, from some of them even the ignominious

passions and the basest actions are not absent," &c.

Having thus shown St. Bernard's account of the Romish clergy, regular and secular, in the twelfth century, he would read a brief extract from another of his works descriptive of the Romish laity; and he selected those people who had possessed the greatest religious advantages, who had enjoyed the presence of the popes and cardinals, and had learned at the fountain-head of apostolicity and infallibility—he meant the people of Rome. St. Bernard thus described the population of Rome in an address to the Pope himself. (*St. Bernardi Abbat. de consideratione*, lib. iv. c. iii.) "What shall I say of the people? They are the Roman people: I cannot explain more briefly, or more expressly, what I think of your parishioners. What is so notorious to the world as the insolence and pride of the Romans, a race of men unaccustomed to peace, and habituated to tumult; rude and ungovernable even to the present day, who only learn obedience, when it is impossible to resist? *They are wise above all to commit evil*, they know not how to do good. *Hateful to earth and heaven*, they have laid their hands upon what appertains to each of them; they are impious towards God, rash violators of holy things, seditious among themselves, rivals to their neighbours, uncivilized towards foreigners; as they love no one, nobody loves them; and since they desire to be feared by all, as a necessary consequence, they are afraid of all others."

He feared that he had almost wearied the meeting with the extracts which he read to them: but it was important to establish the truth, and to allay the fervour of architectural fanaticism. He desired not to be

misunderstood. He did not mean to undervalue the pious labours of those who founded and built commodious churches; nor was he averse to decent ornament: all that he meant to say was, that architectural splendour was no conclusive evidence of the spirituality of a visible Church. He would select the finest Roman Catholic cathedral in all the glory which was exhibited in it on a late occasion—the canonization of certain saints. On that day it was illuminated by the blaze of 4,000 wax candles, all the religious orders were present in full costume, the cardinals were robed in their most splendid vestments, there were discharges of artillery without, and there was most beautiful music within; the Pope was seated on a magnificent throne, elevated upon four pillars, covered with crimson and gold. A finer spectacle could hardly be imagined, and yet he would point out to Mr. Pugin a far excelling temple. He would show him a poor man, clothed in rags, and squalid with honourable, because honest poverty, kneeling in a miserable hut, or perchance kneeling on his dunghill, and offering up from a contrite heart the prayer of faith; and that temple was far more glorious in the eye of the Deity than St. Peter's at the festival to which he had referred. The former was the temple of the Holy Ghost; the latter temple was inhabited by the evil genius of superstition and idolatry. His (Mr. Finch's) opinions upon the subject were most accurately expressed in one of our excellent Church Homilies—(Homily on the Right Use of the Church.) "Indeed, the chief and special temples of God, wherein he hath greatest pleasure, and most delighteth to dwell and continue in, are the bodies and minds of true

Christians, and the chosen people of God, &c. . . . Yet all this, notwithstanding the material Church or temple, is a place appointed, as well by the usage and continual examples expressed in the Old Testament, as in the New, for the people of God to resort together unto; there to hear God's holy word, to call upon his holy name, to give him thanks for his innumerable and unspeakable benefits bestowed upon us, and duly and truly to celebrate his holy sacraments." But whilst he had thus evidenced the inferiority of the Apostles to the Heathens and Jews, in regard to material architecture, he felt that as spiritual architects they were infinitely superior to all who had preceded or succeeded them. They laid the foundations of a temple of most costly materials, composed of living stones, and of gold, silver, and precious stones, and so vast in its immensity, that even if Babel could be erected according to the gigantic conceptions of its rebellious projectors, and rearing its head above the clouds, the apostolic temple would be elevated far above it; for whilst that temple was founded upon a rock, its topstone reached even unto the throne of the everlasting God. And all good Christian ministers, like the wise master-builder Paul, were engaged in the construction of this spiritual fabric; and in the courts of heaven their relative ministerial excellences would be determin'd, not by their title by succession from the representatives of "the man of sin," but by the number of living stones which they had placed in Christ's spiritual temple. And if Mr. Pugin desired an architectural design that was more pictorial, he would refer him to the book of God, to which Protestants referred for architec-

ture as well as faith and piety; and in the Apocalypse he would find a description of a city, to which he (Mr. Pugin) could present nothing equal, even if he were to collect all that was most architecturally noble and grand in the ancient and modern world, in ancient Rome, and Greece, and Asia Minor, and Babylon, and the hundred-gated Thebes. Of the Apocalyptic city it was related, "And the building of the wall of it was of jasper, and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass, and the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones . . . and the twelve gates were twelve pearls, every several gate was of one pearl, and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." And if Mr. Pugin objected that the subject of his essay regarded temples, and not cities, here he (Mr. Finch) felt emboldened to assume a higher tone, and he would say, that if Mr. Pugin were temporarily invested with ubiquity and omnipotence, and were to spoil a thousand suns and ten millions of planets of whatsoever they contained that was most splendid and magnificent, and were out of these spoils to construct a temple for the service of the Deity, that temple would be as inferior to the Apocalyptic temple as universal nature was inferior to the God of nature. For it was written—"And I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." This was the architecture of which Protestants boasted—this was the temple which they venerated; and no other temple was fit for the Christian sacrifice, the sacrifice of his love offered up upon the altar of his heart. Into that temple every true believer had ingress; yes, every penitent sinner who, rising

upon the wings of faith, entered the holiest through the veil, which is Christ's flesh, and took refuge in the bosom of his God.

In conclusion, he entreated the meeting to invite Roman Catholics into that temple, and to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; to gird themselves as men of war for the battle, to put on the breastplate of righteousness and the helmet of salva-

tion, and to take up the shield of faith, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; and to unfurl their banners, streaming with effulgent light from the glorious beams of the Sun of righteousness, who riseth with healing in his wings; and to inscribe upon those banners, in characters so plain and legible that he who runs may read them, "No peace with Rome; peace and love to Roman Catholics."

The Eight Thousand.

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

Now Publishing, in Numbers at Threepence, and complete in One handsome Volume, foolscap 8vo. price 9s. cloth, or 12s. morocco,

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES ; OR, LECTURES ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

BY THE

REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

MINISTER OF THE SCOTCH NATIONAL CHURCH, RUSSELL STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

THESE Lectures were begun in Exeter Hall, during the period occupied in the enlargement of the Church of which the Lecturer is the Minister. Not a few were then afraid that the author might be led into rash and questionable theories in investigating a subject confessedly beset with difficulties ; but, by the blessing of God, and the exercise of caution and prayerful study, all has ended more than satisfactorily. The unprecedentedly large masses of persons of every denomination, and of no denomination at all, who overflowed the spacious hall in which they were delivered, and the growing attention excited in the minds of these audiences, and the saving and very striking impressions made on unconverted minds by the means of the solemn truths they heard, are all signs and tokens that call for humble gratitude to God.

Numerous requests were made for their publication. A short-hand writer was therefore engaged, who took a *verbatim* report of every Lecture. These reports the author has now corrected ; and trusts that the work will be found a substantial summary of his Discourses on the Apocalypse. It is his earnest prayer that these, and all his labours, may redound to the glory of God, and to the good of souls.

By the same Author,

THE TRUE SUCCESSION. A Sermon, Fourth Edition, fcap. 8vo. price 6d. sewed.

INFANT SALVATION ; or, all saved who die in Infancy. Specially addressed to Mothers mourning the loss of Infants and Children. Second Edition, fcap. 8vo, cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE BAPTISMAL FONT. An Exposition of the Nature and Obligations of Christian Baptism, with an Appendix. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.

A MESSAGE FROM GOD ; or, Thoughts on Religion for Thinking Men. Second Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

LONDON :

ARTHUR HALL AND CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

JUST PUBLISHED, A NEW EDITION,
Price 3s. 6d. in cloth, 5s. in roan embossed, and 6s. 6d. in morocco.

THE PSALMS AND PARAPHRASES,

FOR THE USE OF THE

Church of Scotland,

WITH

PRAYERS AND EXTRACTS FROM JOHN KNOX'S BOOK OF
COMMON ORDER,

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH,

AND THE SHORTER CATECHISM, &c. PREFIXED,

AND A SUPPLEMENTAL COLLECTION OF

HYMNS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS,

TOGETHER WITH

EXPLANATORY NOTES AND NAMES OF TUNES,

BY THE

REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

OF THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHURCH, CROWN COURT, LITTLE RUSSELL STREET.
COVENT GARDEN.

THE WHOLE FORMING A COMPLETE MANUAL
FOR MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AS WELL AS FOR THE
VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS WHO ADOPT HER FORMS.

The Profits of the Sale of this Work will be given to the School
Building Fund of the Church in Crown Court.

*** TO BE HAD OF THE PEW-OPENERS AT THE CHURCH ON FRIDAY EVENINGS.

LONDON:

ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE ONLY EDITION CONTAINING DR. SYMINGTON'S
IMPROVEMENTS.

TO BE COMPLETED IN FORTY PARTS, AT TWO SHILLINGS.

THE
REV. T. SCOTT'S COMMENTARY
ON THE
HOLY BIBLE;

CONTAINING THE

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS ACCORDING TO THE
AUTHORIZED VERSION,

ILLUSTRATED BY ORIGINAL VIEWS

OF THE

Scenery and Remarkable Places in and around Jerusalem
and the Holy Land,

INCLUDING

ACCURATE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SCENES OF THE MOST IMPORTANT EVENTS
IN SACRED HISTORY, THE LIFE AND LABOURS OF THE SAVIOUR,
AND THE JOURNEYS OF HIS APOSTLES.

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY,

AND NUMEROUS PRACTICAL, EXPLANATORY, AND CRITICAL NOTES,

BY THE

REV. W. SYMINGTON, D.D. GLASGOW.

*Each Part embellished with Two highly-finished Steel Engravings, or Maps,
from Drawings made on the Spot by Mr. Bartlett, in 1846.*

PICTORIAL ILLUSTRATIONS of the Sacred Volume have been long and deservedly popular, and many valuable works of this class have already appeared. The Publisher of the ILLUSTRATED EDITION of the REV. T. SCOTT'S COMMENTARY has no desire to depreciate the value of any of these, but he hopes that the SERIES of ENGRAVINGS which he has determined upon introducing into that Work has peculiar claims upon the attention of every reader of the Bible. It embraces a collection of beautifully executed Views of all the spots made remarkable by their connexion with the Inspired Narrative, as scenes of the most important events in the history

of God's chosen people; depicting alike their wanderings in the wilderness, and their sojourn in the Promised Land; and including also every part of Jerusalem and Judæa, rendered sacred as the locality of the life and miracles of the Saviour, as well as those places afterwards visited by St. Paul and the twelve Apostles in the course of their holy mission. These engravings are not imaginative pictures, where fidelity to nature is often sacrificed to the production of artistic effect, and which in many cases have little to recommend them beyond the name and talents of the painter; but, on the contrary, they are, in every instance, accurate representations of the present state of the places mentioned, having been all executed from Drawings taken on the spot in the course of last year by W. H. BARTLETT, Esq., who visited the Holy Land expressly for the purpose of furnishing the Christian Public with faithful pictures of Jerusalem, and the land of Judæa, which should enable them to form just conceptions of all those hallowed places so familiar in their daily Scriptural reading and meditation.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"This is a very fine edition of SCOTT, in double-columned quarto, and excellent alike in type and paper. Under the able auspices of Dr. SYMINGTON, it will doubtless receive whatever improvements it can derive from the progress of theological inquiry subsequent to the Author's times. It is printed from that edition which the venerable Commentator had corrected and improved for the long period of twenty years. Dr. SYMINGTON's Essay is written with great power and eloquence; and, as a successful vindication of the Word of God as the only rule of faith and practice, it forms a highly useful and suitable introduction to the Work."—*Scottish Guardian*.

"This new edition does infinite credit to the press of the Publisher. It is printed from the last edition which received the Author's corrections throughout, and is further enriched with an Introductory Essay, and numerous additional Notes, from the pen of our able townsman, the Rev. Dr. SYMINGTON. The plan of publication in Parts has, we think, been wisely adopted, as by that means it can be more conveniently purchased by a numerous class, than if the entire Work was issued at once."—*Glasgow Argus*.

"We cordially welcome this *beautiful edition* of a most valuable work. It would be difficult to estimate too highly the boon thus conferred on the public. If typographical beauty and correctness, Editorship of distinguished talent, and rich embellishments, can secure extensive circulation for any work, this edition of SCOTT's Commentary bids fair to supplant, in general use and reputation, every other that has hitherto issued from the press."—*Scotch Presbyterian*.

"To say anything in praise of the well-known Commentary of THOMAS SCOTT is quite superfluous. It has long been regarded, by all who are qualified to form an opinion on the subject, as one of the most excellent and useful expositions of the Holy Scriptures existing in this or any other country."—*Dumfries Courier*.

"It gives us much pleasure to observe SCOTT's Commentary in the course of being re-issued from the press in a handsome form, under the able superintendence of so distinguished an Editor as Dr. SYMINGTON, whose Introductory Essay forms part of the first Volume."—*Witness*.

"The present is certainly the best and *cheapest edition* of SCOTT's Bible that has been offered to the public. In addition to the marginal references, &c. of the Author, the Work is furnished with valuable additional ones, and an Introductory Essay by the Editor, Dr. SYMINGTON."—*Berwick and Kelso Warder*.

LONDON: GEORGE VIRTUE.

WORKS
PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR HALL & CO.

25, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

Now Publishing in Parts at 3s., each containing Three Plates, Size, Elephant Quarto.

A NEW ILLUSTRATED WORK,

Uniform with "The Royal Gems from the Galleries of Europe."

THE WILKIE GALLERY,
WITH NOTICES BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Engravings are accompanied by original critical notices from the pen of an artist whose abilities peculiarly qualify him to explain and illustrate those numerous points of excellence with which the compositions of WILKIE abound. The work will also comprise a biography of the Painter, written expressly for the WILKIE GALLERY.

A Portrait of Wilkie and a View of his Birth-place form part of the Illustrations.

FORTY DAYS IN THE DESERT,

On the Track of the Israelites; or, a Journey from Cairo, by Wady Feiran, to Mount Sinai and Petra. By W. H. BARTLETT. With Twenty-seven Engravings on Steel, from Sketches taken on the Route, a Map, and numerous Woodcuts. Second Edition. Super-royal 8vo. Cloth gilt, 12s.; morocco gilt, 21s.

The object of this volume is to give distinct and graphic pen and pencil sketches of the ROUTE OF THE ISRAELITES from Egypt to Mount Sinai, dwelling particularly upon the beautiful oasis of WADY FEIRAN, and the neighbouring mountain, the SERBAL, confidently pronounced by Lipsius and other savans to be the real Sinai. The work also embraces notices of the CONVENT OF ST. CATHERINE, MOUNT HOR, and the extraordinary city of PETRA.

WALKS IN AND ABOUT THE CITY AND
ENVIRONS OF JERUSALEM,

Illustrated by Twenty-four Engravings on Steel, by W. H. BARTLETT; a Map, and many superior Woodcuts. Third Edition. Super-royal 8vo. Cloth gilt, 12s.; morocco gilt, 21s.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

ROYAL GEMS FROM THE GALLERIES OF EUROPE,

ENGRAVED AFTER PICTURES OF THE GREAT MASTERS.

With Notices, Biographical, Historical, and Descriptive. By S. C. HALL, F.S.A. Containing Ninety highly-finished Plates, engraved in the first style of art, by W. Greatbach, C. Rolls, L. Stocks, Cousen, and others. Size of the Engravings, $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Complete in Two handsome Vols. cloth gilt, 5*l*.

"They (the plates) are very well engraved, transmitting the beauty of the painting to the engraved resemblance, and conveying a good idea of the brilliancy and clearness of the painters. That this work is a help to good taste, and will do good for the Arts, nobody will deny."—*Times*

THE CHRISTIAN IN PALESTINE;

Or, Scenes of Sacred History. Illustrated from Sketches taken by Mr. W. H. BARTLETT, during his recent Journey in the Holy Land, and comprising Eighty highly-finished Engravings on Steel, by Cousen, Bentley, Brandard, and others. With Explanatory Descriptions, by HENRY STEBBING, D.D. F.R.S. One Vol. quarto, cloth gilt, 2*l*. 2*s*.

THE CASTLES AND ABBEYS OF ENGLAND.

A superbly Illustrated Historical Work by W. BEATTIE, M.D. Member of the Institute of France, and Author of "Switzerland Illustrated," &c. &c. In One Vol. imperial 8vo. price 1*l*. 5*s*.

This work presents Engravings of whatever is most interesting or least known in the Scenery, Style, or Decoration of each subject, and is embellished with Vignette specimens of Castles, Abbeys, Cathedrals, Chapels, Tombs, Altars, Halls, Galleries, Armouries, Portraits and Medallions, Sculptures, Arches, Gateways, Antique Furniture and Inscriptions, Statues and fragments of Art, Festive, Military, and Rural Scenes, Battle-fields, Banquet Halls, National Sports and Athletic Games, and whatever illustrates most forcibly the minds, habits, and pursuits of our baronial ancestors; the whole so distributed throughout the work, that the engravings and the Literary Matter mutually illustrate each other, and bring the Edifices and their Inhabitants once more before the eyes of the reader.

THE WORKS OF BURNS,

(PEOPLE'S EDITION)

Embellished with Thirty-three Plates (after Wright and other artists), illustrative of the principal subjects of his Poems. With a new Life of Burns, and Explanatory Notes preceding each Poem, by ALLAN CUNNINGHAM. In One Volume, super-royal 8vo. cloth extra, 18*s*.

An Edition of this Work, with Sixty-one Engravings, 1*l*. 4*s*.

This will be found the most complete and best edition of the Works of Burns yet offered to the public, and the only one edited by and published under the immediate superintendence of Mr. Cunningham.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

A New Edition, in Three Vols. cloth, 3*l.* 3*s.*

IRELAND,

ITS SCENERY, CHARACTER, &c. &c.

By MR. and MRS. S. C. HALL.

Comprising a faithful Picture of the Green Isle, in its Physical and Natural Aspects.

Combined with abundant Statistical and other Facts, throwing a strong light upon the *present* condition of the people, are Tales of Irish Superstitions, and Stories of the actual life of the Peasants. Also, accurate descriptions of much beautiful Scenery depicted in Forty-eight Line Engravings on Steel, from paintings by T. CRESWICK, A.R.A., and W. EVANS; separate Maps of Counties; and Five Hundred exquisite Wood Engravings, including Personal Sketches of the Peasants, by W. HARVEY, and others; various representations of Monastic and Castellated Remains, and objects of interest, landscape, architectural, and industrial, by A. NICHOLL, and various native Artists.

THE BOOK OF BRITISH BALLADS.

Edited by S. C. HALL, F.S.A.

This beautiful work consists of nearly Four Hundred Wood Engravings, illustrating upwards of Sixty of the choicest British Ballads. The Illustrations have been engraved in all instances by the most eminent British Wood Engravers from Drawings by

Herbert, A.R.A.
Redgrave, A.R.A.
Creswick, A.R.A.

Franklin,
Corbould,
Meadows,

Paton,
Townsend,
Sibson, and others.

Two Volumes, imperial 8vo. price One Guinea each in cloth, or 3*6s.* in morocco.

ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF BRITISH SONG;

Comprising Sixty of the best Songs, by those famous Composers, Purcell, Arne, Handel, Shield, Jackson, Storace, Linley, and others; with Accompaniments for the Pianoforte, newly arranged from the figured basses of the Composers, and Notes, Biographical and Historical, by GEORGE HOGARTH, ESQ. Each Song is illustrated by some eminent Artist: amongst others, are Drawings by Townsend, Meadows, Pickersgill, Franklin, Hamerton, Crowquill, Warren, Topham, Hook, Dodgson, Weigall, Fahey, Anelay, Absolon, and Weir; engraved by Linton, Dalziel, Mason, Green, Landells, Nicholls, Measom, &c.

The Work concludes with the whole of the Music and Poetry introduced in the Tragedy of *Macbeth*, composed by MATTHEW LOCK.

In music folio, elegantly bound and gilt, 2*1s.*

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & Co. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Works by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D.*Eighth Edition of One Thousand each.*

Revised and corrected by the Author.—In One handsome Vol. fcap. 8vo.
cloth gilt, 9s.; morocco gilt, 13s.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES;

Or, Lectures on the Book of Revelation. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D., Minister of the Scotch National Church, Russell Street, Covent Garden.

"These Lectures show the application of Prophecy to the present startling times and events, and have excited a very great interest."

In course of publication,

A SECOND SERIES of the above, as delivered at his own Church.

THE GREAT PROTESTANT DISCUSSION between the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. and DANIEL FRENCH, Esq. Barrister-at-law; held at Hammersmith, in 1839. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.

The Publishers express the opinion of the most competent judges when they state that this book ought to be in the hands of every Protestant in Britain, more particularly all Clergymen, Ministers, and Teachers; a more thorough acquaintance with the great Controversy may be acquired from this volume than from any other source.

INFANT SALVATION; or, All Saved who die in Infancy. Specially addressed to Mothers mourning the loss of Infants and Children. Second Edition. fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE BAPTISMAL FONT. An Exposition of the Nature and Obligations of Christian Baptism, with an Appendix. Uniform with the above, cloth, 2s. 6d.

A MESSAGE FROM GOD; or, Thoughts on Religion for Thinking Men. Second Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE TRUE SUCCESSION. A Sermon. Fourth Edition, fcap. 8vo. sewed, 6d.

LIBERTY—EQUALITY—FRATERNITY. Three Discourses. 1s. 6d.

"IS CHRISTIANITY FROM GOD?" A Manual of Christian Evidences for Sunday School Teachers, City Missionaries, and Young Persons; fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3s.

LECTURES FOR THE TIMES. An Exposition of Tridentine and Tractarian Popery. Beautifully printed in one thick 8vo. Volume, cloth, price 7s. 6d., or in 12mo. small paper, cloth, 5s.

OCCASIONAL DISCOURSES. A Volume of Sermons. In One Vol. post 8vo. cloth, 4s.

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM; or, the Claims of Home and Country to Christian Consideration. An Essay. 8vo. sewed, 2s.

"OUR FATHER." A Week's Family Prayers. 12mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

Also, just published, Edited by the same Author,

THE PULPIT PSALM BOOK. The Psalms and Paraphrases according to the Version of the Church of Scotland, with the names of suitable Tunes, Explanations of each Psalm, and a Supplement of Hymns and Doxologies for Special and Missionary occasions; to which are prefixed, Prayers and Services from John Knox's Book of Common Order, as at the Reformation; also, the Confession of Faith and Shorter Catechism. Peculiarly suitable for Presents to Clergymen, and forming a valuable manual for the Pew and the Family. In cloth, 3s. 6d. Morocco, 6s. 6d.

Works by the Rev. Alexander Fletcher, D.D.

DR. FLETCHER'S DEVOTIONAL BIBLE.

Handsomely printed on fine paper, in Two Vols. 4to. and uniform with the
"Family Devotions," price 3*l.* 10*s.* cloth.

THE DEVOTIONAL FAMILY BIBLE,

With Practical and Experimental Reflections on each Verse of the Old and New Testament, and rich Marginal References, by the Rev. ALEXANDER FLETCHER, D.D. of Finsbury Chapel, London. Embellished with 130 beautiful Steel Engravings, from Paintings by celebrated Masters, and Views of the Scenery of the Holy Land.

Thirtieth Edition of One Thousand each.

Revised and corrected by the Author.—In One Vol. quarto, cloth gilt, 1*l.* 6*s.*

A GUIDE TO FAMILY DEVOTION.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER FLETCHER, D.D.; containing 730 Hymns, 730 Prayers, and 730 Passages of Scripture, with appropriate Reflections. Also, an Appendix, comprising a great variety of Hymns and Prayers, to suit particular Days, Seasons, and events of Providence. The whole so arranged as to form the most complete and distinct Family Service for every Morning and Evening in the year, ever published. It is embellished with Sixteen fine Engravings on Steel, after the old Masters, and a superb Frontispiece.

DR. FLETCHER'S BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.

SCRIPTURE HISTORY.

Designed for the Improvement of Youth. Embellished with 241 Engravings and an elegant Frontispiece. In Two Volumes 16mo. cloth gilt, 18*s.*

SCRIPTURE NATURAL HISTORY.

Illustrated by upwards of 256 beautiful Woodcuts. Two Volumes, cloth gilt, price 1*l.*

SERMONS TO YOUNG PEOPLE.

Three Vols. 18mo. cloth gilt, price 4*s.* 6*d.* each.

FIRST SERIES:—THE WISDOM AND GLORY OF GOD.

SECOND SERIES:—A COURSE OF SERMONS ON OBEDIENCE TO PARENTS.

THIRD SERIES:—ON THE SEASONS AND EVENTS OF PROVIDENCE.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & Co. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN DOWAGER.

The Sacred Classics :

A select Library of Theological Works, being a choice Selection of Sacred Poetry and Sermon Literature of the Seventeenth Century. Edited by the Rev. R. CATTERMOLE, B.D. and the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, D.D. To which are Prefixed, Original Essays, Memoirs, Notes, &c. by Dr. PYE SMITH, ROBERT SOUTHEY, Esq., JAMES MONTGOMERY, Esq., Dr. CROLY, the Rev. W. TROLLOPE, and others. Fcap. 8vo. cloth lettered, 4s. each volume.

The Series comprises the following important Works :—

JEREMY TAYLOR'S LIBERTY OF PROPHECYING; showing the Unreasonableness of prescribing to other Men's Faith; and the iniquity of persecuting different Opinions.

CAVE'S LIVES OF THE APOSTLES AND THE FATHERS. Two Vols.
BATES'S SPIRITUAL PERFECTION UNFOLDED AND ENFORCED;
with an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D.

BISHOP HALL'S TREATISES, Devotional and Practical.

BAXTER'S DYING THOUGHTS.

JEREMY TAYLOR'S SELECT SERMONS.

BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature: to which are added, Two Brief Dissertations. With a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. George Croly, LL.D.

DR. WATTS'S LYRIC POEMS. With a Biographical Essay, by Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D.

BEVERIDGE'S PRIVATE THOUGHTS. To which is added, THE NECESSITY OF FREQUENT COMMUNION. Two Vols.

CAVE'S PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. With an Historical Account of Paganism under the First Christian Emperors; and the Lives of Justin Martyr, and St. Cyprian. Two Vols.

ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON'S EXPOSITIONS OF THE CREED, THE LORD'S PRAYER, AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, &c. &c.

SERMONS, selected from the Works of the most EMINENT DIVINES of the SEVENTEENTH & EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES. Three Vols.

THE HON. ROBERT BOYLE on the Veneration due to God:—On Things above Reason:—and on the Style of the Holy Scriptures. With an Essay, by H. Rogers, Esq.

VICESIMUS KNOX'S CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

HOWE'S SELECT TREATISES. With a Memoir, by Thomas Taylor, Author of "The Life of Cowper," "Memoirs of Bishop Heber," &c.

SACRED POETRY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. Two Vols. Including the whole of Giles Fletcher's "Christ's Victory and Triumph," with copious Selections from Spencer, Davies, Sandys, P. Fletcher, Wither, Bishop King, Quarles, Hebert, and Milton.

JEREMY TAYLOR'S LIFE OF CHRIST. Three Vols. With an Introductory Essay to each Part, by the Rev. Henry Stebbing, D.D.

LOCKE ON THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY. With an Appendix, containing an Analysis of the First and Second Vindications, &c.

BISHOP BUTLER'S FIFTEEN SERMONS, preached at the Rolls' Chapel; and CHARGE TO THE CLERGY OF DURHAM in 1751. With an Appendix by Bishop Halifax.

BISHOP HORNE'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS, with Life of the Author, by the Rev W. Jones, of Nayland; and an Introductory Essay by James Montgomery, Esq. Three Vols.

JEREMY TAYLOR'S HOLY LIVING AND HOLY DYING, with a Sketch of his Life and Times, by the Rev. George Croly, LL.D. Two Vols.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

The only Edition containing Dr. Symington's Improvements.

Complete in 40 Parts at 2s. or in 3 Vols. royal quarto.

Each Part embellished with Two highly-finished Steel Engravings, from Drawings made on the Spot, by Mr. BARTLETT, in 1846.

THE REV. T. SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE,

Containing the Old and New Testaments according to the Authorized Version, Illustrated by Original Views of the Scenery and remarkable Places in and around Jerusalem and the Holy Land, including accurate representations of the Scenes of the most important Events in Sacred History, the Life and Labours of the Saviour, and the Journeys of his Apostles. With an Introductory Essay, and numerous Practical, Explanatory, and Critical Notes, by the Rev. W. SYMINGTON, D.D. Glasgow.

PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS OF JOHN LOCKE;

Comprising—The Conduct of the Understanding—Essay on the Human Understanding—Examination of P. Malebranche's Opinion of seeing all things in God—Remarks upon some of Mr. Norris's Books—Elements of Natural Philosophy—Some Thoughts concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman. With a Preliminary Discourse and Notes, by J. A. ST. JOHN, Esq. Super-royal 8vo. price 14s. cloth lettered.

A NEW POCKET BIBLE

With Scott's Commentary, and copious Marginal Readings, References, &c. With Twenty-eight Illustrative Plates by Artists of the highest celebrity. In royal 16mo. and splendid morocco elegant binding. Price 11s. 6d.

A FAMILY HISTORY OF CHRIST'S UNIVERSAL CHURCH.

By the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, D.D. Demy 8vo. Two Volumes, cloth, 16s.

The intention of this History is to furnish the Heads of Families with the means of instructing those around them in the most important branch of knowledge that can engage their attention. Copious illustrations are given from the writings of the early defenders of the Gospel; the record of general events is founded on the most unobjectionable authorities; and care has been taken to describe, as fully as possible, the labours and struggles of those holy men whose patience and triumphs have ever been considered as affording the best demonstration of the power of Christian faith.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

FOXES ACTS AND MONUMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

With an Introductory Essay; and the whole carefully Revised and Edited by the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D., Author of "Apocalyptic Sketches," &c. Illustrated with numerous Wood Engravings, by eminent Artists, a series of highly-finished Portraits of the leading Characters connected with the Reformation, and other illustrative Plates. In Three large Vols. super-royal 8vo. each containing upwards of 1100 pages. Cloth gilt, 3*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRACTICAL WORKS OF RICHARD BAXTER.

The only complete Edition. Reprinted, without Abridgment, from the Original collected Edition. With an Introductory Essay on the Genius and Writings of Baxter, by ROBERT PHILIP, and a fine Portrait of Baxter. In Four Volumes imperial 8vo. cloth, 3*l.* 3*s.*

"To every religious family able to afford a trifle for the purchase of books, these volumes are recommended as containing a complete Library of practical divinity. No minister of Christian truth ought to be without them."—*Non-conformist.*

THE WORKS OF THE REV. JOHN NEWTON,

Late Rector of the united Parishes of St. Mary Woolnoth and St. Mary Woolchurch-Haw, London. With a Portrait. Also, a Life of the Author, by the Rev. RICHARD CECIL, and an Introduction, by the Rev. FRANCIS CUNNINGHAM, Vicar of Lowestoft. In One Volume, super-royal 8vo. cloth, 18*s.*

CONSOLATION FOR CHRISTIAN MOURNERS;

A Series of Discourses occasioned by the Death of Friends, and other Afflictive Dispensations. By the Rev. ADAM THOMSON, D.D. of Coldstream. 12mo. price 5*s.* cloth.

THE WORKS OF THE REV. ANDREW FULLER.

With a Memoir of his Life, by ANDREW GUNTON FULLER. Super-royal 8vo. With Engravings. Cloth, 1*l.* 4*s.*

"Coming on to modern theological writers, I recommend you to familiarize yourselves with the works of the acute, the philosophical, the profound, the pious, Jonathan Edwards, and those of Andrew Fuller. I know nothing like the latter for a beautiful combination of doctrinal, practical, and experimental religion."—*Counsels to Students of Theology on leaving College, by John Angell James.*

HUME AND SMOLLETT'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

Embellished with numerous Portraits, and Scenes of the principal Events in English History, engraved both on Wood and on Steel. Containing also an Essay on the Study of History, by the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, D.D. With a Continuation to the end of the Parliamentary Session of 1846, by E. FARR, Esq. In Three Vols. imperial 8vo. 2l. 12s. 6d. The Continuation may be had separately, price 1l.

THE HISTORY OF AMERICA,

From the earliest period, comprising the Progress of Navigation—Life of Columbus, his Discoveries—War with the Indians—Conquest of Cuba—Conquest of New Spain, by Cortes—Conquest of Peru—Civil Wars of the Spaniards—Manners, Public Works, and Buildings of the Mexicans—Government of the Spanish Colonies—Trade between Spain and the Philippines—History of Virginia and New England. By J. ROBERTSON, D.D. F.R.S. With a Continuation of the History of the United States to the present time. Illustrated by Twelve fine Views of the most interesting Scenery in the Country, and a Portrait of Dr. Robertson. In royal 8vo. Price 20s. cloth.

ROLLIN'S ANCIENT HISTORY

Of the MEDES, PERSIANS, EGYPTIANS, CARTHAGINIANS, GREEKS, MACEDONIANS, BABYLONIANS, and ASSYRIANS, ALEXANDER THE GREAT, and his Successors. Illustrated by many fine Plates, and a Series of Maps, specially engraved for the Work. The whole corrected and revised by a Clergyman. In Two Vols. 8vo. cloth, 1l. 1s.

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

By EDWARD GIBBON. Illustrated Edition, with a Memoir of the Author, and additional Notes, principally referring to Christianity, from the French of M. GUIZOT. Super-royal 8vo. In Parts at One Shilling. The Illustrations comprise—

1. Maps of the Roman Empire, and of the cities of Rome and Constantinople
2. Architectural Monuments of the different periods, from the Augustan period to the time of Leo X.
3. Views of celebrated cities and important sites, with topographical references.
4. A series of coins, with portraits of some of the most remarkable personages mentioned in the History.

THE PEOPLE'S MUSIC BOOK.

By JAMES TURLE, Esq. Organist of Westminster Abbey; and EDWARD TAYLOR, Esq. Gresham Professor of Music. Complete in Three Volumes, price 1*l.* 12*s.* cloth. The Volumes may be had separately.

I.—Psalm Tunes	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	III.—Songs, Duets, Trios, } <i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
II.—Sacred Music, Chants, &c.	12	0	Glees, Madrigals, &c. } 12	0

A Work intended to meet the growing demand for Music among all classes of the community.—Principally arranged for Four Voices, and an Accompaniment for the Organ or Pianoforte; forming, respectively, a complete body of the best music for the Cathedral, the Church or Chapel, the Family, the Glee Club, and the Madrigal Society.

THE LADY'S CLOSET LIBRARY.

By ROBERT PHILIP, Author of "The Life and Times of Whitfield," &c.
Price 3*s.* 6*d.* cloth gilt, each Volume.

- I.—THE MARYS; or, the Beauties of Female Holiness. Seventh Thousand.
- II.—THE MARTHAS; or, the Varieties of Female Piety. Fifth Thousand.
- III.—THE LYDIAS; or, the Development of Female Character. Fourth Thousand.
- IV.—THE HANNAHS; or, Maternal Influence on Sons. Second Thousand.

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

A splendidly Illustrated Edition, in super-royal 3vo, comprising 120 fine Engravings on Wood, by the Messrs. Whimper, from Designs made expressly for the purpose by Artists of the highest celebrity. Also, Nine elegant Engravings on Steel, a Portrait, and a Fac-simile of John Bunyan's Will. Complete in One handsome Vol. cloth, 18*s.*

THE HOLY WAR.

A most beautiful Work, uniform in size and style, and forming an appropriate companion to the "Pictorial Pilgrim's Progress." Containing numerous splendid Illustrations, designed expressly for this edition. Cloth gilt, 12*s.*

THE WORKS OF JOSEPHUS.

With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. HENRY STEBBING, D.D. Author of the "History of the Christian Church," &c. Illustrated by Eighty fine Woodcuts, from Designs by Melville. Also, Eleven Engravings on Steel, and a Portrait of the Author. Beautifully printed, in One Vol. super-royal 8vo, cloth, 1*l.* 5*s.*

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & CO. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

On the 1st of every Month, price 1s.

SHARPE'S LONDON MAGAZINE.

Edited by FRANK FAIRLEGH ;

A Journal of Entertainment and Instruction for General Reading, consisting of Original Essays, Tales, &c., by Miss AGNES STRICKLAND, Mrs. POSTANS, Mrs. COWDEN CLARKE, Dr. BEATTIE, M.D., W. H. BARTLETT, Esq., J. TIMBS, Esq., and other popular Writers.

This Magazine is printed in super-royal octavo, in a new and elegant type ; each Part contains Two fine Engravings on Steel, from original Designs by the best Artists.

Seven Volumes of the Magazine have already appeared, and may be had, elegantly bound in scarlet cloth, price 4s. 6d. each. Each volume is complete in itself ; they are, therefore, recommended as particularly valuable for Lending Libraries.

THE MANUAL OF MODERN FARRIERY ;

Embracing the Cure of Diseases incidental to Horses, Cattle, Sheep, Swine, and Dogs. By THOMAS BROWN, M.P.S., Member of the Royal Agricultural Society ; late President of the Royal Physical Society ; Author of "Biographical Sketches of Horses and Dogs." Illustrated by 14 beautiful and useful Engravings. Price 13s. 6d. cloth.

Dedicated to the Queen, by Her Majesty's express command.

HOUSEHOLD VERSES.

By BERNARD BARTON. Embellished with a Vignette Title and Frontispiece, engraved by BENTLEY, from Drawings by CHURCHYARD. Foolscep 8vo. cloth extra, price 6s.

STEILL'S PICTORIAL SPELLING-BOOK ;

Or, Lessons on Facts and Objects. Fifth Edition. With 130 graphic Illustrations. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

SELECT POETRY FOR CHILDREN,

With brief Explanatory Notes by JOSEPH PAYNE, Author of "Studies in English Poetry." Fifth Edition, corrected and enlarged for the use of Schools. In 18mo. price 3s. extra cloth.

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & Co. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.

On the First of every Month, in Parts, price One Shilling,
**WITH ENGRAVINGS, BY GEORGE CRUIKSHANK,
 FRANK FAIRLEGH;**

OR,

SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF A PRIVATE PUPIL:

Which, though not exactly a Work of deep and thrilling interest, or quite calculated to harrow the reader's feelings and plough up the inmost recesses of his soul, yet has its good points, as it is hoped all who love real honest harmless fun will acknowledge when they have read it.

SHAKSPERE ILLUSTRATED.

A new Edition, comprising the whole of his Dramatic Works. Also, a Biography of Shakspeare, and an enquiry into the authenticity of his Portraits, by A. Wivell, Esq. The Embellishments consist of a series of Engravings of Scenes in the various Plays, Landscape Illustrations of remarkable Places, and Portraits of distinguished Characters. Super-royal 8vo. Cloth, 1*l.* 5*s.*

New Illustrated Edition of the Works of Miss Jane Porter.

THE SCOTTISH CHIEFS.

With an entirely new Preface and Notes by the Author, a splendid Portrait after Harlowe, Vignette Title-pages, and Eleven superior Engravings, together with numerous Tail-pieces and ornamental Headings, illustrative of the principal scenes and incidents that transpire in the course of this interesting historical work, tastefully interspersed. In Two Volumes, 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

THADDEUS OF WARSAW,

(Uniform with the "Scottish Chiefs," introduced by a new Preface and many Explanatory Notes, written expressly for this Edition by the Authoress, and illustrated by numerous Steel Plates, from Designs by E. CORBOULD, Esq. One Volume, 8vo. cloth, 13*s.* 6*d.*

THE PASTOR'S FIRESIDE.

With an Original Preface and Explanatory Notes, illustrated by numerous Steel Engravings. Cloth, 18*s.*

DE LAMARTINE'S VISIT TO THE HOLY LAND;

Or, a Pilgrim's Recollections of the East, with interesting Descriptions of the principal Scenes of our Saviour's Ministry. Translated from the French, by THOMAS PHIPSON, Esq. Illustrated by an accurate Portrait of the Author, Twenty-two Engravings, and Two Maps, neatly executed on Steel. One Volume, 8vo. cloth. Price 13*s.*

LONDON: ARTHUR HALL & Co. 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.







